

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE second volume of the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* has now been published.

Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt have together edited a *Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel*, which they found last season at Oxyrhynchus (Frowde; 1s. net). It is a mere rag of vellum, a single tiny leaf, torn from the book of some scribe who had the weakness of wishing to crowd as many words as possible into the smallest possible space; but it is legible still, and well worth publishing.

The leaf begins in the middle of a sentence. And the sentence begins in the middle of a speech. It is a speech of our Lord to His disciples, about certain evil-doers who are not easily identified. When the speech is over, Jesus takes His disciples into 'the place of purification.' This was in the Temple. He is met by one of the chief priests, a Pharisee. 'Who gave thee leave to walk in this place of purification and to see these holy vessels, when thou hast not washed nor yet have thy disciples bathed their feet?' Jesus asks if he himself is clean. To which the Pharisee answers, 'I am clean; for I washed in the pool of David, and having descended by one staircase I ascended by another, and I put on white and clean garments, and then I came and looked upon these holy vessels.' Our Lord (who

is always spoken of as 'the Saviour') then answers: 'Woe, ye blind, who see not. Thou hast washed in these running waters wherein dogs and swine have been cast night and day, and hast cleansed and wiped the outside skin which also the harlots and flute-girls anoint and wash and wipe and beautify for the lust of men; but within they are full of scorpions and all wickedness.' And as He proceeds to contrast His own way and that of His disciples 'who have been dipped in the waters of eternal life,' the fragment ends.

What is the worth of it? The editors do not once mention the matter, but the worth of it seems to lie in its bearing upon the criticism of the Fourth Gospel. From wholly uncontroversial considerations the editors conclude that the work of which it is a copy was written about the year 200, the copy itself being made somewhere in the fourth century. Now there is considerable skill in the management of the dialogue, and there is a general comprehension of the situation which the writer wishes to reproduce. As the editors express it, the author is 'more successful in catching something of the genuine ring than many of the authors of apocryphal gospels.' Yet when the references to places and customs are examined, they are found to be irreconcilable with well-known facts, and in themselves incredible. Where

was this 'place of purification,' and where was this 'pool of David'? They are mentioned nowhere else. And is it credible that a chief priest washed himself in a pool of the character that is here described? The editors cannot avoid the conclusion that 'much of the local colour is due to the imagination of the author, who was aiming chiefly at dramatic effect and was not really well acquainted with the Temple.' But the author of the Fourth Gospel, who is accused of drawing as completely on his imagination, never contradicts himself and never blunders in his topography.

There is a good deal in a name, if it is long enough. Balaclava and Omdurman and Oxyrhynchus—they are remembered, not for their outlandishness, but for the satisfaction with which they fill the mouth. The last satisfactory mouthful is Elephantinê. And cheerfully as we have taken to Oxyrhynchus, the familiarity of it is likely to be eclipsed by its later and more sonorous rival.

In the year 1903 Professor Euting published a papyrus which he had bought at Luxor. It was written in Aramaic, and seemed to be part of a complaint made by some persons who dwelt in a fortress called Yeb. The complaint was directed chiefly against the priests of the God Khnûb, because they had stopped up a well which supplied water for the people within the fortress. But the papyrus was only a fragment, and it was not clear to whom the complaint was made, nor who made it.

Professor Euting's translation fell into the hands of Professor Clermont-Ganneau. And when Professor Clermont-Ganneau had studied it, he came to the conclusion that the document had originated in the island of Elephantinê, and that the petitioners were Jews. The discovery was a great surprise. How did Professor Clermont-Ganneau make it?

With the place there was little difficulty.

Professor Euting did not recognize Elephantinê in the Egyptian Yeb expressed in Aramaic characters, and Professor Clermont-Ganneau did. But as to the petitioners. The first thing that Professor Clermont-Ganneau saw was that the petitioners were not Egyptians. Their complaint was against certain priests of the Egyptian god Khnûb, who were supported by an official personage of the name of Widrang. Egyptians would not complain against Egyptian officials and Egyptian priests. Then he noticed that in speaking of Khnûb the petitioners did not call him 'God.' That was extraordinary, especially in a document of a public and quasi-official nature, in which the proper forms of speech should be carefully observed. Who would be so particular about a matter like that? Not Persians, not Greeks, not Nubians. There is only one race that would risk the rejection of their petition rather than speak of Khnûb as God. It is the Jews.

Père Lagrange, who tells the story in the *New York Review*, rejoices in this conclusion as a case of triumphant Higher Criticism. 'Often,' he says, 'such conjectures in the domain of criticism are looked upon as arbitrary and fanciful; and doubtless many, in reading the above, would have perceived nothing more than a bit of guesswork, such as has so often been disproved.' But he claims it as 'another proof of the trustworthiness of good critical methods.' For in three years Professor Clermont-Ganneau's brilliant induction was shown to be correct.

In September 1906 Professor Sayce and Mr. Cowley published a volume of *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan*. It contained ten separate documents, all of which now saw the light for the first time, together with a fragment which Mr. Cowley had already published in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, and five bits of inscriptions from fragments of pottery, apparently belonging to the same group of documents as the papyri. And, last of all, it

contained a reprint of Dr. Euting's 'Strasburg Papyrus,' as it is now called, on which Professor Clermont-Ganneau had worked his Higher Criticism. For Mr. Cowley saw that the 'Strasburg Papyrus,' though it was bought independently at Luxor, had come out of the same box and had been written by the same persons.

A short account of these papyri was given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July. A fuller account must be given now, that the narrative may be complete and that we may be up to date in every particular. For we shall hear of Elephantinê again. Men of the most chastened imagination, like Professor Margoliouth and Mr. Johns, are waiting for the discovery in Elephantinê of a contemporary copy of the prophecies of Jeremiah or a working fourth-century-B.C. edition of the Law.

Well, what do the new documents consist of? They are occupied entirely with business affairs. They are receipts for the transfer of property, for a marriage dowry, or the like. They are public documents, however, written out by a notary and signed by witnesses. They are thus equivalent to a modern contract, although it was not customary with them then as it is with us now for both parties to the contract to sign their names. They are business documents, and if that were all they would be of little interest; for thousands of business documents have already been found in Egypt. But these business documents have mostly been signed by Jews.

Of that there is no possibility of doubt. Many of the names are Jewish unmistakably. Hosea occurs six times; Menahem, five times; Meshullam, five times; Nathan, six times; Ethan, Haggai, Zadok at least once each. Again, there are names which end in Jah. Mr. Johns gives a list of them—Ananiah at least twice; Azariah, twice; Ba'adiah, Berechiah, Gedaliah, Gemariah, twice; Hodaviah, Hoshaiiah, twice; Isaiah, Jezaniah, three times; Malchiah, twice at least; Me'oziah,

twice; Mibhtahiah, Pelaliah, Pelatiah, Qoniah, Reuiah, Uriah, Jedoniah, six times; Zechariah, three times; and Zephaniah. And there are two in which the Divine name occurs at the beginning, Jeho-adar and Jah-hadari.

To those who have time to examine these names, what a world of interest they possess. They are such names as are known to us for the later times of Ezra and Nehemiah. None of the characteristically Maccabæan names occur, like Johanan or Simeon or Joshua. Again, the names of the patriarchs, Abraham, Israel, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, are as entirely absent as if these Jews had no knowledge of such ancestry. Once more, not a name occurs with the compound El in it, like Elnathan or Israel. And, last of all, observe how many of those which do occur have been suspected as corrupt forms in the present text of the Old Testament. 'The old Massorettes,' says Mr. Johns, 'must chuckle in their graves.'

But is there no human interest in the documents? Yes, plenty; and for the most part it gathers round the name of a lady. Throughout the fragments we follow the fortunes of Mibhtahiah. She is a Jewess, the daughter of Mahseiah. She leaves her father's house to become the wife of Jezaniah, bearing her 'tocher' with her in the form of a good piece of land. She is a young woman of business ability. When her father finds himself short of money, she makes him a loan, which he pays back by transferring to her a house of which he is the owner. The limits of the new property are set down accurately by reference to the surrounding estates; on the north it extends as far as 'the altar of the God Yahu.'

In matrimonial affairs Mibhtahiah is not so successful. She divorces her husband, or is divorced by him. And then she marries an Egyptian. That he is an Egyptian seems unmistakable, from his name As-hor, though Mr. Johns reminds us that it is very like the name

Ashur which is found in 1 Ch 2²⁴ 4⁵. About the time of her second marriage Mibhtahiah takes oath in the name of Sati, the Egyptian goddess of Elephantinê. Surely she is a little indifferent in things religious. Or could it be that conscience is at fault? As a too clever business woman, does she *prefer* Sati, arguing that an oath in the name of a false deity can have no binding force? Père Lagrange makes the suggestion. But it does not greatly relieve the situation. On the other hand, we learn that after his marriage As-hor is known by the good Jewish name of Nathan. Let us give Mibhtahiah the credit for that. And, more than that, the names which she gives her two sons are the names of her own grandfather and father, Jedoniah and Mahseiah, biblical names both. It is evident that Mibhtahiah is a genuine Jewess. She has not become an Egyptian, she has made her husband and her family Jews.

When As-hor married Mibhtahiah he paid for his bride a sum of money to her father. To herself he presented a variety of articles which are carefully set down in the settlement, and seem to have been chosen with judgment—'a bronze mirror; a bronze salver with two bowls, and a cup of bronze; a bed of papyrus with stone legs; a terra-cotta vase; two urns, and one new ivory cosmetic box.' He even assisted the bride with her trousseau—'a garment of new wool, embroidered in colours on both sides, size eight cubits by five; another piece of new cloth, seven cubits by five; another woollen garment with fringes, six cubits by four.'

In course of time Mibhtahiah dies, but we can follow the fortunes of her family after her death. Her sons appear in a lawsuit. They are challenged to restore a deposit which had been committed to the care of their father As-hor. And it is important to observe that the case is tried before Widrang, the governor of the Egyptian garrison in Elephantinê. We have heard of Widrang already. We shall hear of him again.

For the most remarkable of all these discoveries has yet to be recorded.

In 1907 Dr. E. Sachau, of Berlin, published three Aramaic papyri. They also had come from the island of Elephantinê. They consisted of three letters. One of the letters, or a copy of it, had been sent by the Jewish community in Elephantinê to Bagohi, the Persian governor of Judah in the time of Artaxerxes II. (404-359 B.C.), the Bagoas of Josephus. The second was a mutilated copy of that letter, perhaps its first rough draft. The third was Bagohi's reply.

The writers of the first letter complain that their temple in Elephantinê, which had existed for more than a hundred and twenty years (for they say that it had been built before the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 B.C.), had been ruthlessly destroyed by Widrang. They say that the priests of Khnûb, taking advantage of the absence of the Governor of Egypt, had bribed Widrang, who was local governor at Elephantinê; that Widrang had called his son, who had charge of the garrison in Syênê, on the opposite bank of the Nile, to bring across a body of troops; and that thereupon they had together destroyed the temple of the God Yahu, and had carried away its gold and silver vessels. The petitioners remind Bagohi that this happened some time ago, that they had sent a letter to himself at the time, as well as to Jehohanan, the High Priest in Jerusalem, but had received no answer. They now beg Bagohi to permit the rebuilding of the temple.

It may be easier for Bagohi to listen to their prayer now. For apparently something has happened in the interval to Widrang. What has happened to him the petitioners do not clearly say. What they say is that 'the chain (of office? queries Driver) has been removed from his feet.' It may be degradation; it may be something worse. They add that all the goods which he had acquired have perished. And not only is Widrang apparently out of the way, but 'all the

men who wished evil against the temple are slain'; and they add, a little vindictively but in Biblical language, that they 'have seen their desire upon them.' And then, perhaps to encourage Bagohi to execute that justice which is so ripe, they promise a reward, and it appears to be a very substantial one. In the third of the documents Bagohi replies that the temple may be rebuilt in its place as it was before.

Now there is no doubt whatever that all these documents belonged to the same colony of Jews in Elephantinê. Dr. Euting's papyrus was bought in Luxor, Professor Sayce's were chiefly acquired in Assuan; but it may be considered settled that they all came originally from the same spot as did Professor Sachau's, that is to say, from one or other of the mounds which mark the site of the ancient town in the island of Elephantinê. The confusion with Assuan (Greek Syênê), which is on the opposite bank of the river, may be due to the fact that Elephantinê is now called by the Arabs Gezîret Assuan, or the Island of Assuan.

Now this island of Elephantinê, as the Greeks called it, or Yeb (Abu), as it was called in ancient Egyptian (both words meaning the place of the elephant), attracted the attention of the men of science who accompanied Napoleon on his Egyptian campaign. They came upon it from the south, not by sailing up the Nile from Cairo as modern tourists do; and they greatly relished its beauty and shade: 'The verdure and freshness of its fields,' says Jomard, who wrote this chapter of the *Description de l'Égypte*, 'form such an agreeable contrast with the arid tracts of soil by which it is surrounded that it is surnamed the Flowery Isle and the Garden of the Tropics. The traveller whose curiosity is dulled, and who is exhausted by wearisome journeys, experiences a lively feeling of joy on coming to this island which looms up suddenly before his gaze like an enchanted spot in the midst of the blackish peaks and shining sands which occupy and fill the horizon.' But the Jews who dwelt in Elephantinê

were not, we may be sure, attracted solely by its scenery. Who were they, and what were they doing there?

Let us first make sure of the dates. And about them there is no uncertainty. The documents are dated. They are dated by the year of the reigning Persian king. And not only so, but they contain the month and the day, both according to the Egyptian and also according to the Babylonian method of reckoning. They extend over sixty years, from 471 to 411 B.C.. As a writer in the *Church Quarterly* puts it: 'When Mahseiah gives permission to Qoniyyah to build in a gateway belonging to the former, Xerxes is reigning as King of Persia. Egypt is subject to him; but the vast empire is no longer in the state Darius Hystaspes left it. It is the ninth year after that fateful campaign when

A king sate on the lofty brow
That looks o'er sea-girt Salamis,
And ships in thousands lay below.

Not long after Mahseiah's grandsons settle the transaction recorded in another document, Egypt is lost to Persia, and has regained her independence. Between these dates lie the last six years of Xerxes, the whole reign of Artaxerxes the Longhand, and thirteen years of the reign of Darius Nothus.'

Well, we know that after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldæans, a number of Jews took refuge in Egypt, carrying Jeremiah with them. And we know that Jeremiah denounced them there for their idolatry. But this was about the year 586 B.C. Can the Jews of the time of Xerxes be their descendants? They may be. They claim that their temple had lasted at any rate since the year 525 B.C. It is true they speak Aramaic, not Hebrew. But if Jeremiah and his fellow-exiles entered Egypt speaking Hebrew, it does not follow that their descendants would continue to speak Hebrew. They might learn to speak Egyptian, the language of their neighbours. It is more probable that they would learn to use

Aramaic, the official language of their Persian masters and the colloquial tongue throughout even the late Assyrian empire.

Other suggestions have been made. Professor Schürer recalls a statement which occurs in the famous letter of 'Aristeas' which describes the origin of the Septuagint. The letter so bristles with blunders that the statement has passed unheeded. Now it assumes importance. For in that letter it is stated that many Jews came with the Persians, or were brought by them, into Egypt. What were they brought there for? To till the land? That is unlikely. The native Egyptians knew the soil, and they have always taken to agriculture more readily than the Jews. Perhaps to form garrisons here and there. Well, Elephantinê was a fortress, and a most important one. And in these papyri there are expressions which have an unmistakably military ring about them.

But the most surprising suggestion has yet to be mentioned. It is that these Elephantinê Jews, who have been so unexpectedly discovered, are a portion of the lost Ten Tribes.

The author of this suggestion is Professor Bacher, of Budapest. And Professor Bacher is a sober Jewish scholar of the highest reputation. For once we may look at an argument for the recovery of the lost Ten Tribes without a hint of insanity.

In the newly recovered documents, says Professor Bacher (you will find his article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for April), one of the most frequently occurring names is Hosea. Now in the Bible the name Hosea is almost exclusively applied to Ephraimites. The oldest bearer of the name is Hosea the son of Nun, afterwards known as Joshua, who was of the tribe of Ephraim. In the tribe of David there was a Hosea (1 Ch 27²⁰) who was Prince of the tribe of Ephraim. The Prophet Hosea was probably an Ephraimite; and the last king of this realm was Hosea the son of Elah. Elsewhere the name Hosea occurs but once

(Neh 10²⁴). 'As, then,' says Dr. Bacher, 'this name appears in the colony of Elephantinê as one of the commonest personal names, it seems reasonable to suggest that the colony, at least in part, consisted of descendants of people belonging to the Ten Tribes.'

Professor Bacher's argument could take a little further support. He seems to feel that. He observes that the name Menahem also occurs pretty frequently in the papyri. And the only occurrence of Menahem in the Bible is as the name of one of the last kings of the Northern Kingdom, who came from Tirzah, and therefore was an Ephraimite. Then, to strengthen it still further, he combines it with the hint which Professor Schürer has recovered from the epistle of 'Aristeas.' He believes that there came with the Persian army under Cambyzes into Egypt not only Judeans from Babylonia, but also descendants of the Ten Tribes from their second home in Assyria and Media; that they received grants of land in Egypt, and when they found themselves together, as at Elephantinê, they coalesced, but, for a time at least, retained both the name Judeans or Jews and also the name Aramæans, which the Ten Tribes had likely come to be known by in the lands of the Exile. And whether this is the meaning of it or not, it is certain that the members of the colony in Elephantinê are spoken of in the papyri sometimes as Jews and sometimes as Aramæans.

Professor J. G. Frazer has decided to publish the third edition of his *Golden Bough* in five parts. The titles which are to be given to the parts are: 'The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings'; 'The Perils of the Soul and the Doctrine of Taboo'; 'The Dying God'; 'Adonis, Attis, Osiris'; and 'Balder the Beautiful.' One of them is issued already and has reached a second edition. It is *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (Macmillan; 10s. net).

The volume is further described as 'Studies in the History of Oriental Religion.' For the most

part these studies are outside the Bible. And that is well. For when Dr. Frazer does touch the Bible his touch is apt to be disconcerting. It is not that he dislikes the Bible, as if he were an aggressive rationalist. There never was a student of religion who was more guiltless of evil intention. Nor is it that he does not recognize the beauty of the literature and the worth of the religion which the Bible contains. Has he not made a selection of fine passages from the Bible, and added notes on their religious significance? It is that he has come to a close study of the Bible after having steeped himself in the religion and magic of the uncultivated nations of the earth. He therefore discovers in the Bible analogies to savage belief, and survivals of primitive practice, where the ordinary student of the Bible sees nothing that is out of accord with the worship of that God who is a Spirit and is worshipped in spirit and truth.

Here and there throughout his new book Dr. Frazer touches the Bible, but the principal place is in the first of his appendixes. He calls the appendix 'Moloch the King.' It is well known that in the Old Testament there are several references to the passing of children through the fire to Moloch. There are three things to look at in these references.

The first is the ceremony itself. What was it? Dr. Frazer does not discuss that fully, but he makes it clear that he does not accept the gruesome stories of the Jewish midrashim that children were roasted to death in the arms of a red-hot idol. On the other hand, he does not believe that they were merely passed over the fire, according to a ceremony which still exists here and there. He has no doubt that the children were first put to death, and then burnt in the fire as holocausts.

The next thing is the question to whom these terrible sacrifices were offered. The name is given in the Hebrew text as Molech. It is not Moloch, as the Authorized Version spells it in two places

(Am 5²⁶, Ac 7⁴³), after the Greek. Now Molech is usually taken as a corruption for *melech*,—a corruption purposely made, in order to suggest the vowels of *bosheth* or abomination. And *melech* is the ordinary Hebrew word for 'king.' It may be, therefore, that these sacrifices were made to any god who might happen to be the king of any particular nation. And Dr. Frazer believes that they were offered by the Israelites to Jahweh. He believes that they were part of that popular religion, caught from the Canaanites perhaps, which was widely practised in Israel down to the Captivity, but of which we hear little in the literature unless by way of condemnation.

The last thing is the meaning of the rite. It is here that Dr. Frazer is at home. It is here that his knowledge and his independence have free play. There are two interpretations, and he offers the one as an alternative to the other. The simplest explanation is that the sacrifice to Molech was 'a particular application of the ancient law which devoted to the Deity the first-born of every womb, whether of cattle or of human beings.' But the other explanation is more to Dr. Frazer's liking. It is that the children were sacrificed in order to prolong the life of the human king.

Now there are two ways in which they might do this. They might have a substitutionary value. Not, however, that they were offered as a vicarious sacrifice for the sins of the king that were past. Even the king of Israel was more concerned, Dr. Frazer thinks, with the future than with the past. He was more anxious to prolong his earthly life than to be reconciled to a righteous God. And he presents examples (which are odious enough) of kings, and queens also, who offered their children not for the sin of their soul, but for the continuance of their days. For they believed that their god would be satisfied for a time, as a hungry wolf might be, by devouring one of their children. Might he not even be satiated at last by devouring them one after another, and so let the king literally live for ever?

But again, the sacrifice of the children might have, not a vicarious but a magical value. That is to say, the earthly king believed that when a child was put to death, if the proper rites were employed, its young life might be made to pass into his aged body, and enable him to renew his strength. Under this belief the sacrifice of animals is common enough all the world over. But sometimes it is the sacrifice of human beings, and perhaps in earlier days it was always so. Among the rest Dr. Frazer thus explains those wholesale massacres which have given such an evil name to a recent king of Uganda.

There is no difficulty which the preacher of the gospel has to face that can for a moment be compared with the difficulty of bridging the gulf between himself and his congregation. The difference between them is not due to rank. In some parts of the country there never has been such a difference, and it is passing away from every part. It is due to mental training. It is due to the fact that the preacher is trained to think abstractly, while the average hearer cannot separate nature from natural things, or hear of a law of nature without thinking of the commandment of a lawgiver. Professor Sanday deals with this matter in his latest book, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*.

He deals with it under the title of 'Symbolism.' For the preacher, who has always been trained to think in abstractions, is now trained also in the methods of physical science. He must have facts. Therefore, when he reads that the Devil set Jesus on a pinnacle of the Temple, the modern preacher searches his books for a plan of the Temple, and is dissatisfied until he has discovered the pinnacle and measured the height of it. Professor Sanday does not think that the historian of the temptation knew the height of the pinnacle of the Temple or cared to know. It is part of a symbolism which he used for conveying his meaning and which came quite naturally to his hand.

The modern hearer is at one with the ancient historian. It may be that he does not think in metaphors as Orientals do. In his prosaic Western way he probably reads the symbols of the Bible literally first of all. And he will continue to read them literally until it is explained to him that they are symbols. But the moment that this is explained to him, he understands the symbol, and is glad. The height of the pinnacle of the Temple expressed in feet conveys to him nothing of the meaning of the Temptation. It rather comes in between him and his understanding of the Temptation. But explain to him that the pinnacle of the Temple, and even, if you will, the Devil that carried Him there, are symbols used to express that spiritual conflict which came to Christ as it comes to every man, then he will feel the grandeur of the Temptation as well as the nearness of it. For the mind that is untrained scientifically passes easily from outward facts to inward imaginings.

In proof of this, it is perhaps enough to remember that poetry is almost as old as prose, not only in the life of the world, but also in the life of every individual that enters it. But a more appropriate proof is found in the recollection of the joy with which our fathers listened to sermons on the Song of Solomon. There never was in Scotland a more popular preacher, at any rate at Communion seasons, than Robert Murray M'Cheyne; and when you are shown M'Cheyne's pulpit Bible you observe at once that it is thumb'd black at the Song of Solomon, while the other pages are unsoiled. We have left all that behind us. But men of fifty will tell you that congregations do not listen to a preacher now as they did in their early youth, when the text was, 'Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness leaning on her beloved?' or, 'He brought me to the banqueting house, and his banner over me was love.'

Well, we must get back to the symbolism of the Bible. Professor Sanday protests against the application of the rigid rules of physical science to

the first three chapters of Genesis. He does not deny that there was a time when it was necessary to point out that the statements of these chapters regarding the origin of the world and man, taken literally, are not in accord with the discoveries of modern science. That was when the inspiration of the Bible was identified with verbal infallibility. 'But I cannot help hoping,' he says, 'that the time has come when such corrections will no longer be thought necessary; when, in other words, it will be assumed from the outset that the representations in Gn 1-3 are symbolical, and that they were never intended to be literal.'

Now, to come back to the symbolical language of the Bible does not mean that we shall be able to preach our grandfathers' sermons. For the scientific spirit has not been among us for nothing. On the one hand, it is probable that the Song of Solomon will never again be interpreted as if it were *intended* to be typical of Christ and the Church. So that even in the 'distribution of the elements' the Scottish preacher may never be able to recover the old accent as he repeats the words, 'Eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved.' But, on the other hand, he will understand, and be able to make his people understand, that the trees in the garden of Eden are no longer to be sought for in manuals of practical forestry, and that the Cherubim and the flame of a sword which guarded the gate of it are things which never were on land or sea. Yet he will preach his own sermons about the garden of Eden, and his people will listen again as intently as they did in the emotional days of Murray M'Cheyne and the Song of Solomon.

Suppose that his text were Gn 3²⁴. These are the words of it: 'So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.' He might preach his sermon in this way.

Of the trees which grew in the garden of Eden,

two are particularly mentioned, the Tree of Life and the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. The Tree of Life grew in the midst of the garden. For to eat of its fruit is to do the will of God, and the will of God may always be found by those who look for it; every straight path leads directly to it. And what is this will of God? It is peace and rest; it is the joy of fellowship and all that makes life worth living; it is health, and strength, and growth, and continuance. It is to dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Where did the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil grow? Not in the midst of the garden. Out of sight and inconvenient if one desired to do the will of God; but suddenly near, in the way, and temptingly attractive, if one preferred to do one's own will. For the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil is the opportunity to say, 'Not Thy will, but mine be done.'

Now when the man ate of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil he was driven out of the garden. The knowledge is not denied. It is not denied that the fruit of the forbidden tree has enlarged the experience of life. But it is the knowledge that enables the wealthy manufacturer to defy the law and draw much profit from his sweating dens; it is the experience of life of those who wait with impatience for what is euphoniously called 'the age of consent.' Such knowledge and such experience are impossible where God is. Now God is in the garden. For

A garden is a lovesome thing, God wot!
Rose plot,
Fringed pool,
Fern'd grot—
The veriest school
Of peace; and yet the fool
Contentends that God is not—
Not God! in gardens! when the eve is cool?

Yes, God is there. And therefore man who has eaten of the forbidden fruit cannot be there. So He drove out the man.

And He placed at the east of the garden of Eden

the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life. In the year 1900 there was published a most unpretentious volume which had no other title than *Sermons* (Oliver & Boyd). It was written by the Rev. Rayner Winterbotham, who was then Canon of St. Mary's Cathedral in Edinburgh. Among the sermons contained in it there is one which is described as 'A Sermon upon Nature and Conscience.' Its text is the text before us. It is a short sermon, occupied entirely with the meaning of these two symbols, the Cherubim and the flame of a sword. To Canon Winterbotham the one stands for nature and the other for conscience.

There is first of all, however, a word of introduction on the reason why God drove out the man. Canon Winterbotham sees that it was not so much by way of punishment for his sin as from the very necessity of the situation. But besides that, the man had to be driven out, because that was the very best thing for him since he fell. 'Mankind has risen slowly to its present state of power and progress, just because it was driven out. It has risen because it had to fight its way up against a multitude of difficulties and obstacles which gradually called out and educated its powers and faculties of body and of mind. Go the world over,' says Canon Winterbotham, 'and you will find that exactly those races which might seem to have been most effectually "driven out" and left furthest off from the earthly paradise, have been the races which have attained the highest civilization.'

Then he comes to the Cherubim. Now, in the symbolism of Scripture two offices are ascribed to the Cherubim. They maintain the majesty of God, and they represent the sum of natural things. First, they maintain the majesty of God. In Ezekiel the chariot of God is composed of Cherubim; and in the Apocalypse (under the name of the four living creatures) they are seen 'in the midst of the throne' and 'round about the throne.' They express not merely the

presence of God, but His unapproachableness—His unapproachableness otherwise than in the way which He Himself has appointed. It is for this reason that they are admitted into the Temple and into the Tabernacle, in the very teeth of the second commandment—two veritable and undeniable graven images spreading their wings there over the Mercy Seat.

Secondly, they represent the sum of natural things. They belong to no single type of creature life. In their appearance several types are blended together so as to suggest them all. So the Cherubim were placed at the gate of the garden of Eden that they might guard the approach to that place where God dwelleth, and that they might at the same time suggest to man that all nature unites in maintaining God's unapproachableness. Debarred from intercourse with God, there is the possibility that man will take to worshipping the creature. But no ancient Israelite with a clear conscience can make the serpent or the bull objects of his worship, or even the sun and the moon. For the Cherubim, the representatives of all these, stand at the gate of Paradise declaring that they are but the creatures of God's hands, and, more than that, His servants, whose very business it is to maintain His honour. Nor need any modern millionaire dream that he can by amassing money find out God. For the very things which he handles so successfully shape themselves into menacing Cherubim and stand between him and the Paradise where God is found.

The last symbol is the flame of a sword. Not a flaming sword, you observe. That, says Canon Winterbotham, is a poor, prosaic watering down of the original. It is as if some magic sword bathed in heaven and wielded by some invisible angelic virtue were leaving its scorch and radiance upon the yielding air, as it played hither and thither with the velocity of lightning. And what is this flame of a sword? What is this thing, more subtle and more inscrutable than even the Cherubim, yet meeting one at every turn and

hopelessly barring the way—barring the way not by any solid obstacle, but by the sense of dread, dread of the unknown and awful? It is the conscience of sin.

There is not anything, says Canon Winterbotham, more subtle and unsubstantial than the conscience of sin. You try to set it down in black and white; you try to fix it in the language of theology; it ever evades you. You have your definition, your terminology, your religious phraseology, but your sense of sin has vanished. Prove to a man that we are all by nature the children of wrath; that the Scripture has concluded us all under sin; that all have sinned and come short; that there is none righteous, no, not one; that the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; that our very righteousnesses are as filthy rags. He assents or dissents. But he feels nothing. For the flame of the sword is playing in some other direction at that moment.

There are innumerable persons who say that they have no sense of sin. And they have not. For the flame of a sword plays only at the east of the garden of Eden. They are ranging in the wilderness. They are pressing west and north and south. At the most they see only the far-off glare and glitter of it as one may see the reflected brilliance from an electric lighthouse leaping upon the clouds from below the horizon. But let them set their face eastwards and homewards. Let them at last with weary heart and tired thoughts seek for peace and satisfaction. Then they will really encounter the sternness of the brandished flame.

And what are they to do then? Let us turn to another volume of sermons, a volume that has just been published. Its title is *The Unescapeable Christ* (Wellby; 3s. 6d. net), its author the Rev. Edward W. Lewis, B.D., of Grafton Square Con-

gregational Church, Clapham. In that volume there is a sermon on 'The sword that guarded the Tree of Life.' It takes our subject up just at the place to which we have carried it now. How are we to reach the Tree of Life? The things of nature and the sting of conscience, the gigantic Cherubim and the flash of a sword, are in the way. Yet we must reach it. Mr. Lewis is as clear as Canon Winterbotham that we must reach it. 'We must fight to win it,' he says; 'we must arrive by force.'

And then Mr. Lewis, who belongs to the New Theology movement, gives us stimulating pictures of the children of Israel marching out of Egypt, and following a devious, perplexed, and weary way through the wilderness, that they may reach Canaan and the Tree of Life; of Jesus, tempted in the wilderness, harassed by Pharisees, intrigued against by Herodians, unsupported by the multitude, misunderstood by His own, passing within the deep shadow of Gethsemane, and then ascending the way of the cross that He may win His way to the Tree of Life. Mr. Lewis, we say, teaches the new theology. Nevertheless he seems to say that the Israelites suffered in the wilderness not for their own sakes only, but for our sakes also. He distinctly says that Christ went forth bearing His cross 'not for Himself alone, but for us.' And if he means all that he says, then he says rightly. For the way to the Tree of Life *is* to be won by fighting. 'To him that overcometh,' are the words of the Apocalypse,—'to him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.' Christ suffered that we should suffer with Him—

And in the garden secretly,
And on the cross on high,
Should teach His brethren, and inspire
To suffer and to die.

But let us know assuredly, that the way to the Tree of Life will never be won in single combat.

Christian Unity.¹

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

IN the Constitution of this Association, under the heading 'General Aims,' the first statement made refers to 'the consciousness of underlying unity,' beneath our differences; the second, to practical problems in which co-operation is possible; the third, to the discussions of doctrinal and ecclesiastical topics in which we may differ. A later article divides the procedure of the ordinary meetings into one part for devotional purposes, and one for discussions. It is that very admirable and suggestive order of thoughts which I have taken as the guiding line in the following paper.

That the underlying unity beneath our differences is there, I have long held as one of my profound convictions. Where men are at once intellectually honest and spiritually earnest, they may express themselves so differently as even to seem to contradict each other, but they mean the same thing. Christian men are all turning their eyes towards the Mountain of the Lord. Standing, because they have dwelt, at different points of the region, the mountain they look towards must seem to have several different shapes and proportions and colours; yet it is the same mountain, and the very differences that appear in their descriptions are due to the honesty and earnestness of their common vision of it, and their loyalty to that vision. At a time like this, our aim should surely be, not to emphasize the differences and to record new testimonies as to where we stand among them, but to find every means available by which we may become reconciling and constructive men, who interpret apparently conflicting voices in a common tongue.

Now, as our Constitution shows, the first and most obvious field on which we may find our unity is that of action. Even such (so to speak) negative basis of unity as that required for combating some common evil will serve this end. M. Zola, in his brilliant and terrible account of the Franco-Prussian War, speaking of a company of artillerymen, says, 'That beloved creature, the gun, grouped

a little family around her, whose members were closely united by the bonds of a common occupation.' There is, unfortunately, no lack of common evils, calling for united action in those who would oppose them; and, amid the depressing and discouraging feelings that the strength and persistence of these evils often bring, it is good to remember that at least in this one respect we may find some soul of goodness in them, that they bring us nearer to one another while we seek to face them.

When we turn from the field of action to that of thought, we find ourselves at once on far more difficult and more important ground. More important, because for what is worthy of the name of Christian Unity we must not have to depend on anything casual. Common circumstances or exigencies of any kind—common sorrows, calamities or dangers—unite us but for an occasion; and we long for a deeper and more permanent bond of union. But this ground is difficult, for while action is comparatively simple, thought is infinitely complex; and this must necessarily be still more the case in religious than in secular matters, where the keenness and importance of convictions are necessarily less. Even among those who hold a common creed, there will still, while the intellect retains its right of freedom, be differences of interpretation. And in the knowledge of divine things, no less than in the investigation of the facts of the world, so long as the mind of man is alive and not dead, there will be progress, involving, as all movement does, diversity of view. We cannot possibly escape from this. Our birth and heredity involve it, our education emphasizes it, our circumstances and our duties continually reinforce it. On this field every attempt at enforcing uniformity either from without or from within has failed, and ought to fail. There is no hope of uniformity among living thinkers, and there is no reason for desiring it.

But when we turn from the field of thought and theory to that of religious experience, we come upon the real ground of unity. 'The unity of Protestant theology in a common peaceful task far removed from the noise of ecclesiastical party

¹ A short address delivered at the Devotional Meeting of the Christian Unity Association of Scotland, October 8, 1907.

strife, will at last be attained if we devote our attention to that which is usually expressly conceded by the one opponent to the other. Our opponents do not deny our personal Christianity. Well, then, let the endeavour be made on both sides to describe what we understand by personal Christianity. Christians are fully agreed as to its general meaning. It is a communion of the soul with the living God through the mediation of Christ. Herein is really included all that belongs to the characteristic life of Christendom—revelation and faith, conversion and the comfort of forgiveness, the joy of faith and the service of love, lonely communion with God, and life in Christian fellowship. All this is, then, only truly Christian when it is experienced as communion with the living God through the mediation of Christ.¹ It might be feared that the inwardness of this region of experience, its essentially subjective elements, might still continue to keep us isolated. Every man's experience, as much as every man's thought, is his own. Yet, as Herrmann goes on to point out, the bond is really objective. There is an objective source and centre of our manifold subjective experience. In communion with the one living Christ, we have a direct contact with a unifying fact at the centre. 'We are Christians because, in the human Jesus, we have met with a fact whose content is incomparably richer than that of any feelings which arise within ourselves.' Each for himself, we know, recognizes and is very sure of God. Yet our Christianity does not dissolve in subjective conditions. It points back to history, and it finds its unifying and perpetuating bond in the actual and eternal personality of Jesus Christ, whom each Christian deals with, loves, obeys, and trusts; and through whom each derives his conception of, and finds his communion with, God. The region in which this ideal of Christian unity will have by far the best chance of effectively and worthily realizing itself will therefore be neither that of action nor of theory, but that of experience. This devotional meeting, in which we together seek and find communion with God through Christ, will ever be the central point, and the most vital point, of all our endeavour. Here, perhaps more than in any other part of our work

¹ Herrmann, *Communion with God*.

together, we find the value of our fellowship with one another. The Communion of Christians is an agency and a power at the very heart and centre of our religious life. Here, as elsewhere, we find ourselves by way of the world. Private religious experience is never complete—can never fully understand its own meaning even—until it is taken out into the open and shared with other Christians. This communion supplies some elements necessary even to the most intimate and private experience. It remains one's own after having passed through the fellowship of others, but it is better every way for that passage—healthier, more balanced, and more fitted to become practically effective in the days to come.

The central unity of experience, as we have seen, is not a merely subjective matter. Its subjective elements lay hold on, and are held together by, the commanding objective facts of God and Jesus Christ. But, if that be so, then there ought to be a reaction of experience upon theory, so that our unity of experience should ultimately be found to modify and possibly to remove our divergences of creed. Of course, since the facts of God's revelation to Man, and especially the fact of Christ, are facts in human history, they are necessarily subject to the difficulties and questions that beset all facts in history—questions of criticism and questions of interpretation. Yet in three ways especially, in spite of all such remaining complications, the definite insistence on religious experience as the essential ground of religious unity, ought to react on our doctrinal and theoretical relations with one another:—1. It should banish from the creed of us all everything that would lead us to question *à priori* the genuineness of the religious experience of others who profess to hold actual communion with God through Christ. 2. It should set a type and method for our discussion, utilizing the elements contributed by experience, and testing dogma by experience rather than experience by dogma. 3. It should help us, in this way, towards a standard which would enable us more clearly to distinguish among the doctrines of our faith, those to which we ascribe absolute value from those whose value is merely relative and provisional.

Sören Kierkegaard.

A STUDY OF THE THIRD SECTION OF HIS *STADIA UPON LIFE'S WAY*.

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER GRIEVE, M.A., D.PHIL., GLASGOW.

KIERKEGAARD'S *Stadia upon Life's Way* was published in 1845, when his age was thirty-two, and he had but ten years to live. The title is suggestive and poetical, and as such is not belied by the contents, for in this work Kierkegaard's rich and glowing diction, his psychological insight, his dialectic craft, and his mastery of the whole diapason of feeling, are seen at their best. For the uninitiated, however, the name of the book will hardly give the clue to the actual theme, and some little explanation may not be out of place.

The work by which Kierkegaard passed at a leap to the front rank of Danish literary genius was his *Either—Or*, published in 1843. The alternatives with which this work deals are the *Æsthetic* and the *Ethical* ways of life, or, more simply, the life of pleasure and the life of duty. These are not discussed in the manner of the moralist or the mere scientific investigator, but each side is exhibited by a representative adherent, who, in the frankest way, tells us of his thoughts, feelings, and actions. The reader is left to draw his own conclusions—a characteristic procedure of Kierkegaard at this period of his literary activity. Now the *Stadia upon Life's Way* takes up again the two modes of life, the *Æsthetic* and the *Ethical*, and once more each is set forth by its respective partisans; but a third stadium, namely, the *Religious*, is added, and dealt with in a similar way, save that it is supplemented by a series of comments by an 'observer' who calls himself *Frater Taciturnus*. The whole work is ostensibly given to the public by a *Hilarius Bogbinder*, and Kierkegaard's own name does not appear anywhere in the book.

Disregarding, for the sake of space, the reasons which led Kierkegaard to conceal his personality by an intricate system of pseudonyms, or rather pseudo-characters—a subject which would require a whole essay to itself—we proceed at once to say that the third section of the *Stadia* bears the rubric 'Guilty?—Not Guilty?' and that its essential part takes the form of a diary. The *Religious* stadium, in a word, is simply the story of an unhappy love-affair and a broken engagement, and is delineated

in the journal of the young man principally concerned. The entries are all made within some six months, but as the diarist uses his morning hour in recalling what took place 'a year ago to-day,' and at midnight sets down the reflexions and doings of the day just closed, the record really covers a period of a year and a half. The writer is a young man of twenty-five, and in his personality are combined a passionate love of the beautiful, a highly developed moral sense, and a keen intellectual power—gifts which, however, are so far counterbalanced by an inherent dejection and morbidity of spirit. 'Melancholy marked him for her own;' despondency was rooted in his very being. Even as a child he had felt its clammy chill in his soul, as an extract from one of his midnight reveries will show:—

'There was once a father and a son. A son is like a mirror, in which the father sees himself; and the father is likewise a mirror, in which the son sees what he will be in days to come. These two, however, seldom looked at one another in this way, for their daily intercourse was enlivened by cheerful and sparkling conversation. But now and again the father would stand still, and, bending a sorrowful countenance upon his son, would say to him, "Poor child, you live in dumb despair." Nothing more was ever said as to what these words might mean, true though they were. The father believed that he was responsible for his son's melancholy, while the son took the guilt of his father's sorrow upon himself—but never a word passed between them on the subject.'

As a matter of fact, the father *was* the cause of his son's 'dumb despair.' The elder man, brooding over a sin committed in his childhood, had become a prey to despondency, and the unwholesome spirit had with unabated virulence found its way into the child's soul, discolouring and embittering his whole personality. It is the source of all the trouble that follows.

The young man is attracted to a maiden of eighteen, and with (as he thinks) the fullest recognition of all moral demands, he becomes engaged

to her. She is a bright, innocent, happy creature, and her frank affection does for him what David's playing did for Saul; it drives away the evil spirit for a time, and he is hopeful that she may permanently deliver him from its grasp. She was not rich, as he puts it, but she might well say what the apostle said to the paralytic: 'Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee; rise up, be whole!' This gleam of hope, however, was soon quenched, and the old despondency again asserted its power, coming over the young man's spirit with such intensity as to convince him that it was past remedy, and that in all his plans and expectations for the future it must be taken into account as an inexorable fact. For it was no cloud of external circumstance that darkened his way: it was a shadow that he bore with him as he went.

As the betrothal did not bring the lasting emancipation it seemed to promise, the young man feels himself faced by a moral problem of the utmost gravity, namely, whether he should in honour follow up and consummate an alliance which could not but blight the maiden's young, fresh life. But having pledged her his word, and still yielding to her all the allegiance of his heart, he cannot meanwhile think of breaking troth with her, even in her own best interests. He resolves, therefore, to keep his melancholy in hiding from her; to wrestle with it in the secret places of his soul, but in all his dealings with her to wear the guise of optimism and geniality, so that she may still be his without danger or harm to herself. He soon sees, however, that such a policy is impossible; sooner or later his inner malady would burst from behind the curtains of concealment, show itself in his life as a Thing to which power had been given, and inevitably infect her too with its miasma. Here we give an illustrative fragment from another of his midnight entries: the soliloquy of Simon the leper:—

(Simon wakes out of his sleep among the tombs; his companion, Manasseh, also a leper, is nowhere to be seen.) 'What has become of Manasseh? . . . Manasseh! . . . Ah! he has gone off to the city. Well do I know why. I have made an ointment, the application of which will cause all the leprosy to strike inwards, so that no one can see it, and the priest must needs declare us clean. I showed Manasseh how to apply it; I told him that it did not really cure the disease, but forced it inwards, and that then our breath would infect

others, and give them the leprosy in a visible form. And Manasseh was wild with joy, for he loathes existence, he curses mankind, and he will be revenged; so he hurries to the city, breathing poison upon all. O Manasseh, Manasseh, why hast thou given place to the devil in thy soul, was it not enough to be leprous in thy body?

'I will throw away the rest of the ointment, so that I may be tempted no more. God of our father Abraham, may I forget how it is made! Father Abraham, when I die, I shall awake in thy bosom, I shall eat bread among the purest, for thou hast no fear of the leper! Isaac and Jacob, ye do not fear to sit at meat with one who was a leper and abhorred of men! Ye dead, who sleep around me here, awake but for a moment, hear a word, only one word: take my greeting to Abraham, and bid him have a place ready among the Blessed for one who could find no place among men.'

The plan of screening his melancholy thus proving abortive, the young man casts about for another expedient by which to render the marriage possible. The idea comes to him that the burden of his rooted sorrow might somehow be shared, and so made tolerable for both, if they could unite in a truly *religious* fellowship. It is in religion alone that he finds relief, and in the likely case of the malady being conveyed to the maiden after marriage, religion might avail for her too. Accordingly, he seeks to turn her thoughts to sacred things, but as her innocence and her traditional faith are enough for her, she proves insusceptible to the deeper voices of the spirit. His attempts to school her in religion are a complete failure; he succeeds merely in wearying her, and so that way of escape is also barred.

Eventually, then, he has to take a step which involves the sacrifice of his dearest affections and hopes, and the wronging of one who is more to him than all else in the world: he must break the engagement. But when he tells her of this resolve, the effect is beyond anything he had anticipated. She is simply stunned, for, though she had sometimes wondered at his strange manner, she had never understood its secret cause. Nor can she understand even now: the blow is but a piece of heartless and meaningless cruelty. She tells him that it will be her death, thus laying, as he says, a murder upon his conscience. She adjures him by the name of God; by that holy

name (Christ) which he seldom utters, though he venerates it more than any other name; and by his hope of salvation. He is staggered by these high and solemn appeals. His departed father's memory rises to rebuke him; the thought of Christ's name being used against him overwhelms him; and he withdraws the words by which he had sought a termination of the engagement.

Nevertheless, such is his ideal of marriage, and such his conviction that a marriage with him would be the deathblow of her happiness, that he cannot abandon his purpose of preventing their union, cost what it may. Only one way is now left. He must 'work her free'; he must bring her to such a view of him as will dispose her to make the rupture of her own accord. So opens what he calls his 'period of terror,' the period during which the furnace of agony is heated for him seven times. He begins by treating her as if his love for her were fled. As David changed his behaviour at Gath to save his life, the young man changes his to save his honour. He becomes an intolerable babbler of nonsense. He tries to efface every feature of his character that may have evoked her affection; he speaks and acts like a boor. Strange conduct, indeed; yet all for the highest end. On the altar of the ideal must be offered up his tenderest feelings; out of his very love for her, he must wound her to the heart. It is Abraham lifting his knife to slay his son (see Kierkegaard's *Fear and Trembling*). But the young man's sacrifice, unlike Abraham's, is accepted to the last drop of blood, for at length she can bear no more, and bids him go. At last, then, he is free, and he has 'wrought her free,' as well.

The bond between these unhappy lovers being now ruptured, it might seem that the matter was ended. But the young man soon finds that, so far from that being the case, his ordeal of suffering has but taken another form. His mind begins to perplex itself with the question whether he has not done the maiden an irreparable injury. He has, it is true, made the only available exit from a dire and bewildered situation. But ought he not to have foreseen his incapacity for marriage, and so avoided giving a pledge he could not keep? Is he not guilty of bringing confusion into an innocently happy life? May he not have planted in her heart the seeds of mistrust, suspicion, unbelief, despair—and who shall say what the harvest may

be? Thus his conscience goes on tormenting itself with the question, 'Guilty or Not Guilty?' He listens eagerly for every word that others say regarding her; he even watches her on her walks, that he may discover whether the consequences of his conduct towards her are such as he dreads. But finding no conclusive answer to his question by that means, his mind simply preys upon itself, and the whole world seems for him to turn upon that one problem—'Guilty or Not Guilty?' Something has wormed its way into his life, and he cannot get it out again. 'A mussel lies upon the seashore. As it opens its shell in search of food, a child thrusts a stick between the valves, and the mussel cannot close them again. At length the child tires of his amusement and withdraws the stick. But a splinter remains behind, and though now the mussel closes its shell, it feels the pain within, and cannot expel the splinter. No one can see that there is anything the matter, for the mussel has shut itself in, but well the creature itself knows that the splinter is there.'

Is there no relief, then, for such a wretched and self-tormenting mind? Can the divided soul find nothing to annul the inner cleavage? Yes! once more religion comes to his aid, and peace and reconciliation come with it. The young man's misery leads him to a deeper understanding of himself; he realizes as never before his need for God, and it is only by laying hold upon the Divine that he wins a solace for his distracted spirit. Even so, it is true, he secures no permanent sense of triumph, for when his personal grasp of the Divine relaxes, he is again in the clutch of the evil thing—a mere insect in the hands of a cruel child. But so long as his soul clings to God, as Jacob clung to the angel at Peniel, so long, even in the sternest recognition of his guilt, he enjoys the priceless blessing of a humbled and repentant spirit, and the hope of the Divine forgiveness. Only in the living and working experience of religion does his strange lot gain meaning and purpose; only in God, as a personally appropriated fact, does his life, such as it is, become endurable at all.

Such, in the barest outline, is the narrative which runs through the third section of Kierkegaard's *Stadia*, and furnishes the motive of the Religious stadium. The theme is certainly one which, in the hands of a Meredith say, might have been wrought into a tale of outstanding power, but it is perhaps

not easy to see why Kierkegaard fixed upon such an unconventional story as the basis of his delineation of religion. Some explanation is necessary, and may, moreover, prove helpful in bringing us face to face with the distinctive principles of his method and work.

In the first place, religion was for Kierkegaard a fact of life, a section of actual experience—not a theory of life, or any view or conception of things, however true or imposing. He was a declared enemy of everything in the nature of a 'system' such as Hegelianism, which he held to be an 'attempt upon the life of morality.' He is little concerned with doctrine, nor has he any purpose of modifying the orthodox rule of faith. For him life is the great thing, and his exposition of religion must in consequence be the portrayal of an actual fusion of religion and life—of a soul in grips with God. A man's religion, in short, is not his thoughts about God, but the actual incidence and operation of Divine things in his experience. Hence it was quite in line with Kierkegaard's general standpoint to depict religion at work, to set forth its action and influence in a particular case. One of his favourite watchwords was *Existence*, and with that upon his lips he took the field against all whose rallying-cry was *Thought*.

Further, Kierkegaard was concerned to show that religion was an inward and personal matter, involving not merely one, but an endless series of volitions. It was not the actual truth of a man's belief that saved his soul, for such truth is essentially general; it was rather his personal appropriation of the truth. Not in the objective and the universal, but alone in the subjective and individual, lies the grand secret. He even affirmed, in fact, that 'Subjectivity is Truth,' *i.e.* that the ultimate value of a doctrine consists in its power to dominate the soul. 'Only the truth which edifies is truth for me,' as it is put in the last sentence of *Either—Or*. Orthodoxy or heterodoxy is a distinction of secondary moment, as witness a sentence from his *Final Unscientific Postscript*, published the year after the *Stadia*—'Take a man living in Christian society, who goes to the House of God, to the House of the true God, and with a true conception of God in his mind: say that he prays, but prays in falsity of heart; then take a man who lives amidst idolatry, but who prays with all the passion of infinity, though his eye be fixed upon an idol; in which of the twain is there most

truth? The latter prays in truth to God, even though he bows to an idol; the former prays to the true God in falsity, and therefore in reality worships a false god.' Here we have the idea of *Inderlighed*, 'inwardness,' which Kierkegaard opposes to the easy-going religion of his time.

Finally, should it be objected that the case of the young man in the story is of an extreme and abnormal character, Kierkegaard's answer will be that the individual is, as such, something apart and *sui generis*. Is it not a fact that men most frequently seek to extenuate their moral lapses by pointing to some exceptional factor in their particular disposition or circumstances? As a matter of fact, each has his own peculiar thorn in the flesh, which in a manner lies beyond the scope of the categorical imperative, and so makes him an exception. But then, Kierkegaard holds, it is precisely this unconformable and intrusive element—the splinter within the shell—with which religion is designed to deal; this it is which should drive a man to seek God, and which should provide the material in which religion performs its strange and special work. Religion, in short, recognizes that very element in a man which makes him exceptional; nay, it emphasizes and transfigures it, making it the basis of his peculiar relationship to God. Hence Kierkegaard's insistence upon the *Enkelte*, the individual in his unique and solitary travail with his soul and with his God.

We may observe, in concluding, that neither the diary nor its appendix of comments contains any direct appeal to the reader, who is left to make of the matter what he can, or rather what he *will*. The book resembles, and is in fact designed to be, a parable—one of those which give light to such as want to see, but which intensify the darkness to the wilfully blind. This is Kierkegaard's 'indirect method,' so characteristic of his earlier period. In his later works the appeal is direct, unmistakable, searching. But from first to last he had in view a single purpose, namely, to arouse men to a sense of the majesty, the sternness, the urgency of Christ's call to take up the cross and follow Him. Nor did Kierkegaard demand in others a stringency he had not first applied to himself. With unscaled vision he looked upon the ideal, and if sometimes, out of mercy to others, he seems to say that the ideal is too high for mortal strength, yet in his own hard and lonely ascent towards it he never faltered or looked back, and he died with the flag in his hand.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.¹

THIS volume is accurately described by its sub-title. It is a 'contribution to the history of exegesis and to the history of mediæval literature,' and is the outcome of studies preparatory to an edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews for Zahn's well-known Commentary on the New Testament. Professor Riggenbach's exhaustive learning and critical acumen remind us constantly of Zahn himself. His primary object was to investigate the origin and history of commentaries on *Hebrews* in the Western Church, with the view of tracing back interpretations of the text to their earliest Patristic sources. But the various complex problems which confronted him at every step have led him far afield. As the result of his patient labour, many obscure places in the Church history of the early Middle Ages have been freshly illuminated.

The fact that Hebrews was not admitted into the Canon of the Latin Church until the fourth century had a marked influence on the history of its exegesis. The earliest Latin commentary on the Epistle seems to be a translation of Chrysostom's Greek Homilies on Hebrews, prepared at the instance of the famous Cassiodorus, about the middle of the sixth century. This was the work of a certain Mutianus, and it remained the basis of all exegetical study of the Epistle to the Hebrews throughout the Middle Ages, so far as the Western Church was concerned.

Perhaps the most interesting general result of Professor Riggenbach's investigations is the binding authority in the Latin Church of what may be called the exegetical tradition. In the course of his researches he was led to expend an immense amount of labour on an exposition of Hebrews, published under the name of Remigius, Bishop of Rheims (*Maxima Bibliotheca*, vol. viii. pp. 889-1124), and also under that of Haimo, Bishop of Halberstadt (*Migne*, vol. cxvii. pp. 361-938). To his patience, which must have been positively unlimited when one considers the material with which

he had to deal, we owe the establishing of the fact that the commentary belonged to neither of these bishops, but is the work of a simple French monk, Haimo of Auxerre, whose pupil Heiric was the teacher of another Remigius, of Auxerre. The names had become confused; hence the erroneous designations of the commentary. For those of us who may have little inclination to read Haimo, the main point of importance about his commentary is its marked dependence on its Patristic predecessors—notably Chrysostom's Homilies. He shrinks from pronouncing judgments of his own, preferring to give his readers their choice of various interpretations. Unfortunately, many modern exegetes suffer from the same perverse modesty. It is refreshing to come across notes such as, *e.g.*, those of Wellhausen and Denney, which require no formidable array of known or unknown names to bolster them up. This repetition of earlier comments may be followed back through Riggenbach's inquiry.

A famous expositor of the beginning of the ninth century was Claudius of Turin. He names as the sources of his commentary on Hebrews the commentaries of Origen, Apollinaris, and Didymus, and the works of Augustine. An accurate examination of the text reveals no traces of these authorities. But he has made the most lavish use of the translation of Chrysostom and of a commentary by Alkuin, the famous Frankish theologian. What of Alkuin himself? Two-thirds of his work are derived verbatim from Chrysostom. The fact that a convenient and adequate Latin translation of Chrysostom was available by the end of the sixth century proved of fundamental importance for the whole subsequent history of exegesis in the Latin Church. The period was one of storm and stress. There was little leisure for thorough Biblical study. When the opportunity came there was hesitation and timidity. 'The mere attempt at seeking to understand a subject better than the revered teachers of the ancient Church seemed to them senseless arrogance' (p. 3). Hence the commentaries of the Middle Ages (from 600 A.D. downwards) are little more than compilations, usually published anonymously, and reiterating, to weariness, the same ideas and applications.

The careful reader will light upon many acute

¹ *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Herausgegeben von T. Zahn. 8 Teil, 'Historische Studien zum Hebräerbrief.' 1 Heft, 'Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief.' Von E. Riggenbach. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907. Pp. x+243. Price M.6.80.

suggestions, ranging over a wide field, in this learned and exhaustive study.

H. A. A. KENNEDY.

Knox College, Toronto.

From France and Italy.¹

WE notice first a group of French Protestant writings.

Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES have already been put in possession of the views which characterize what has come to be known as the Paris School.² In the present tractate M. Ménégos elaborates his thesis that the science and the philosophy implied in the Bible are not binding on us, and that its historical statements ought not to be set up as articles of faith. No scientific datum, in or out of the Bible, can be an object of religious faith. The Logos doctrine was derived from pagan philosophy, and it is now a sacred duty to assist in shaking off its chains. It is not necessary to accept Christ's bodily resurrection as an historical fact. It will thus be seen that M. Ménégos' application of his central principle carries us a long way.

M. Haldimann's lucid little book is for the most part an exposition of that principle. The famous formula, 'We are saved by faith, independently of our beliefs,' has been hotly assailed by other French Protestants, and it is but fair to say that our author succeeds admirably in rebutting most of their objections. Yet we must admit that in the system of Fidéism here advocated, too wide an

extension is given to the meaning of the word 'Faith.' And on the other hand, whilst saving Faith is doubtless compatible with the most diversified beliefs or defects of belief, it should surely be possible to build up a system of Christian doctrine which could be held by intelligent and educated men.

Here is a fresh and stimulating presentation of 'The Person and Work of Jesus.' M. Bois does not share the readiness of the Paris School to sacrifice the miraculous: 'As science has not succeeded, and will not succeed, in proving the impossibility and unreality of human freedom, so it has not succeeded, and will not succeed, in proving the impossibility, the universal and absolute unreality, of divine freedom, that is to say, of miracles.' He dwells with great force on the uniqueness of Jesus, and one of the best sections is that in which he details the considerations which compel us to believe in the sinlessness of our Lord (pp. 36-44). But his Christology is not that of Chalcedon: our Saviour is, to him, Son of God in the moral, not the metaphysical, sense.

Next come five works from the other side of the pale.

In *Le Catholicisme et La Société* two learned Roman Catholic laymen sketch the ever-varying relations betwixt Church and State from the dawn of Christianity to the present hour. They are equally at home in tracing the position which the Church was led to assume towards the barbarian races which took the place of the Roman Empire, in discussing the Reformation and the Anti-Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in describing the course of French ecclesiastical affairs since 1870, or the changes which the Tractarian movement has wrought in England. When they handle the burning questions of to-day they must expect to arouse contradiction. Many French Roman Catholics will not endorse their hearty welcome of the Law of Separation. They are certainly mistaken as to the attitude of English High Churchmen and leading Nonconformists. And some of us who are ardent admirers of J. H. Newman fail to see that his *Apologia* 'has every likelihood of being for modern England what the prophecies were for Israel.' But when all needful deductions have been made, it remains true that whilst the authors' point of view is one of cheerful loyalty to the

¹ *Une Triple distinction théologique.* Par E. Ménégos. Paris: Fischbacher.

Le Fidéisme. Par Hector Haldimann. Paris: Fischbacher.

La Personne et l'Œuvre de Jésus. Par Henri Bois. Orthez: Moulié et Grandperrin.

Le Catholicisme et La Société. Par M. Legendre et M. J. Chevalier. Paris: Giard et Brière.

Lo Gnosticismo. E. Buonaiuti. Roma: Francesco Ferrari.

Il Canone Biblico. F. Mari. Roma: F. Pustet.

La Poésie de l'Évangile. Par M. l'Abbé Gratieux. Chalons-sur-Marne: Martin Frères.

Fatti e Dottrine. Fra Agostino Gemelli. Roma: Tipografia Dell'Unione Co-operative Editrice.

Morale de la Nature. Par M. Deshumbert. London: D. Nutt.

Anquetil Duperron. Par Mlle D. Menant. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

² See vol. xv. p. 30.

Roman See, they evince everywhere an ample knowledge and strong grasp of facts, the ability and disposition to criticize their own friends outspokenly, and a scrupulous fairness towards outsiders.

Lo Gnosticismo deserves a warm welcome. It supplies a clear account—if such a thing be possible—of the speculations of the great Gnostics and their successors, bringing out the nobler, as well as the more fantastic, side. The search for ‘origins’ is pushed as far back as possible, and a good point made by the reference to the influence exercised by Neo-Platonism. And if Signor Buonaiuti grants the truth of Preuschen’s dictum: ‘Only where there are clear ideas of the nature and history of Gnosticism is a satisfactory grasp of the nature and development of primitive Christianity possible,’ he none the less criticizes vigorously Harnack’s tendency to exaggerate the effect produced by the Gnostics on the doctrine and ritual of the Church. But the outstanding feature of the book is the use made of original Gnostic documents which have only recently become available. Extracts from them not only prove that Irenæus had genuine Gnostic writings before him when he wrote the *Adv. Hæreses*: they also give us a first-hand impression of the real character of Gnosticism; the wildness of its fancies, the strangeness of its ritual, the profound religiousness of some of its developments. A short chapter on the fascinating topic of Gnostic gems is well done.

Professor Mari’s eighty pages contain a brief, popular, but scholarly history of the formation of the Canon of Holy Scripture. It is quite refreshing to find a Roman Catholic book, published by authority, giving such really Catholic lists of books recommended. And it is significant of the headway made by Biblical Criticism to read here of Ezra’s idea of ‘promulgating officially a new redaction of the law.’ Amidst much that is commendable special mention should be made of the excellent sections on the apocryphal and the pseudepigraphic writings.

In a discourse primarily addressed to young people the Abbé Gratieux calls attention to the æsthetic qualities of our Lord’s teaching. He points out that it is not necessary to write in verse to prove oneself a poet. He adduces well-chosen illustrations of the delightful imagery and lofty sentiment which characterize the words of Jesus,

the love of Nature, the beauty and dramatic force of the parables, the rhythmic cadences, the parallelisms which remind us of Psalms and Proverbs.

Lombroso’s assertion of the causal connexion between Degeneration and Criminality has acquired an immense influence over education, judicial proceedings, and social life. If he is right, criminals are not responsible. Fra Gemelli renders public service in exposing his inconsistencies and the unreliability and lack of scientific exactness of his methods, in exhibiting also the divergences of opinion within the ‘Criminal School.’ He proves conclusively that although a large number of criminals are degenerates, hereditary degeneracy is but one factor out of several. Nor can it be irresistible if some degenerates continue to obey the Moral Law. The proportion of criminals who exhibit organic and functional defects is shown to be much smaller than Lombroso states, and the characteristics of the ‘criminal type’ appear to be frequently acquired rather than inherited. Altogether this is a timely and useful essay.

For the other two booklets a few words must suffice.

The author of *Morale de la Nature* has had a simple task. Starting from the assumption that nothing exists above and beyond Nature, he must draw all his ethics from within her bounds; from the ‘morals’ of the plants and animals, from the history of mankind; the latter being assumed to have proceeded without any Divine Guide or Inspirer. The list of duties thus ascertained is a highly respectable one. Whether ‘Nature’ furnishes adequate motives to ensure our performance of them is another matter. Mlle Menant pronounces a well-merited eulogy on the labours of that enthusiastic scholar, Anquetil Duperron, to whom we owe the first translation of the Zendavesta.

JOHN TAYLOR.

Winchcombe.

Jesus and Paul.¹

THESE are significant publications, they indicate a new departure. In the first place, they mean that

¹ *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*. Herausgeben von Fr. Michael Schiele. Tübingen: 1 Reihe, 14. Heft. *Paulus und Jesus*. Von Prof. Adolf Jülicher, Marburg. 50 Pfg. *Lebensfragen*. Herausgeber H. Weinelt.

the inquiry into the origin and character of Christianity has passed from academic circles out into the world in which ordinary men live and work. In some respects this is a great gain. It simplifies the issues, and it constrains our German friends to write so as to be understood by the non-academic man. All the books before us are written lucidly, simply, and intelligibly. No one can mistake their meaning. In the second place, they indicate that we are on the eve of a great controversy, the issues of which are more momentous than any that we have ever had. The popular books on the history of religion, of which the book by Jülicher forms one, is a series which has a definite Weltanschauung to maintain, and it is set forth plainly in the Prospectus of the series. The first two books of the series, one on Jesus by Professor Bousset, and the second on Paul by Professor Wrede, have been translated into English, and are accessible to English readers. Of these we do not speak here, or only incidentally. The other series is called *Lebensfragen*, and is edited by Professor Weinle, whose standpoint is now well known. Both are addressed to the people, and both advocate a view of the universe which subverts anything resembling the views of the Christian Church. Both attenuate Christianity until it becomes a religion which exhausts its meaning within the present life. The aim of Weinle, as gathered from his various works, seems to regard the State as the organism within which a man can and ought to realize himself and his ideals, whatever these may be. The modern State is to occupy, he seems to say, the position which the Roman State occupied at the beginning of our era. It claimed that its citizens should find scope within the State for all their energies, and find in it satisfaction for all their needs within it. So the modern State is to satisfy the intellectual, the artistic, the moral, and the spiritual needs of men. It ought to realize their ideals. As a consequence the character of Christianity is attenuated in the *Lebensfragen* until it becomes fit to be confined within these bounds.

The books seem to claim a rigid adherence to the scientific method. Indeed, the prospectus

promised that they would respect the inviolability of the scientific method. With regard to the books before us, we begin with the last on our list. Dr. Kaftan enters into a friendly controversy with the series of popular books on the history of religion. The introduction is a protest against the view set forth in the prospectus. He is opposed altogether to the Weltanschauung set forth in it, and he combats one by one the various propositions contained in it. He has a good deal that is relevant to say about these propositions. No doubt his polemic is carried on from his own point of view, and has peculiarities which belong to himself and his own School of Theology. But from his own point of view his polemic is effective, and many of his arguments are of value to those who do not accept his theology. He passes from the polemic against the assumptions of the prospectus, and sets himself to consider the work of Bousset on Jesus and the work of Wrede on Paul. It is a vigorous argument, conducted on historical grounds, and leads him to the conclusion that the Jesus who appears in the pages of Bousset is not the Jesus of History, and the Paul of Wrede is not the Paul whose letters are in our possession. His contention is that these writers have not drawn their materials from history, but from their own fancy. The pictures of Jesus and Paul, drawn by them, are not those which meet us in the New Testament. It is not possible to unfold the argument here, but it is an argument which deserves close study.

Professor Jülicher had agreed to follow up the treatises on Jesus and on Paul with a book on the two together. But as he was writing the book the treatise of Dr. Kaftan was published, and he felt that he must so far deal with it. It led him also to change the title to *Paul and Jesus*, under which it now appears. He deals with the argument of Dr. Kaftan, in so far as it attacks the general position from which the series is written. He agrees with the editor, and disagrees with Dr. Kaftan. He also believes in the inviolability of the scientific method. But he disagrees with Bousset and Wrede, but expressly says that their errors—and he submits that there are errors in their books—were the result of personal defect, and were not due to their method. His own position is not so extreme as those set forth in the works of Bousset and Wrede. His argument is clear, and so far reasonable, and he admits a good

Wer hat des Christenthum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus. Von Arnold Meyer, 60. *Jesus und Paulus.* Eine Freundschaftliche Streitschrift gegen die Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbücher von D. Bousset und D. Wrede von Dr. Julius Kaftan. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

deal more than his predecessors have done. Yet he holds that Paul's view of faith is not that of Jesus. His argument is set forth under the following heads:—(1) The cleft between Paul and Jesus; (2) the agreement between them; (3) the explanation of the agreement and difference; a concluding section sums up the results. Not Paul but Jesus is the Founder of the Church. It is not possible to enter into detail, but it is a book which students will have to reckon with.

Professor Meyer, of Zürich, in his answer to the question who has founded Christianity, Jesus or Paulus, covers a good deal of ground. In his preliminary statement he sets forth Christianity in its great historical forms, Catholic and Protestant. With neither of these does he agree. Then he treats of Paul, first as to the sources of our knowledge of Paul, then of the gospel of Paul, of the theology of Paul in its peculiarity, of Paul's theological system, and finally of its origin. No reader of the Paul of the Acts and of the Epistles would recognize the Paul of these pages. According to Professor Meyer, Paul was a Gnostic, and in his Epistles are the germs of the developed Gnostic system. Take, for example, the relation of God to the world, Professor Meyer affirms that, ac-

cording to Paul, God stands in no immediate relation to the world. Through His Son, God made the world; at a more remote distance between God and the world move the archons, or world-elements, that rule the times and the seasons. There are angels, throne principalities and powers that intervene between man and God, and so on. Forgetful of the statement that we have access directly to the Father, and of many other statements to the effect that of Him, and to Him, and through Him are all things. In truth he does not argue the question. Finally, he has a study of Jesus, and comes to the conclusion that not Paul but Jesus is the founder of Christianity. But it is not the Jesus of the Gospels that was the founder of Christianity, but the Jesus that remains after the critics have removed from Him all that they think is due to the idealizing reflexion of the Church. In these books there is no inquiry into the capacity of the early Church to perform such a colossal task. To the present writer it is easier to believe in the Jesus of the Gospels than to believe in the capacity of the Church, to conceive and to draw a figure so unique, so great, and so transcendent as the Jesus of the Gospels.

JAMES IVERACH.

Aberdeen.

The Life of Faith.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. W. W. HOLDSWORTH, M.A., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

I.

The Obedience of Faith.

Ro 1¹⁷, 'In the gospel is revealed a righteousness of God, from faith unto faith; as it is written, The righteous shall live from faith.' Mk 3¹⁻⁵, 'He entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had his hand withered . . . and he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth: and his hand was restored.'

In far distant times there came to the great Arab chief, whom we know as Abram, the conviction that he was called to leave that portion of the desert within which he and his fathers before him

had fed their flocks, and to go forth into a land which he knew not (He 11⁸). This was no natural instinct; it was the very contradiction of all that was native to the man. The conviction brought on a great crisis in his life, but he obeyed the impulse which he was convinced was divine. With a perfect abandon he followed the direction which was to him the voice of God, and doing so he has become the 'Father of the faithful,' the very prototype of faith for all time.

Years passed. His children have learned in Babylon the bitterness of exile and captivity (Hab

2⁴). To them there comes a prophet who says, 'Accept this discipline. Yield yourselves up to God in that obedience which shall declare the perfect submission of your spirits to His will; and out of this bitterness of exile, out of the blood and tears of your captivity, shall come the cleansing of your national life, deliverance from the fetters of evil habit, the uplifting, the spiritualizing of all the thought of your people, until your surrender to the will divine shall be that in which you shall find your higher life, and by your faith you shall realize the life of righteousness.'

Again the years have passed. A great Christian philosopher writes down the words which are to stand for all time, shaping to noblest issues of spiritual life the thought of unborn generations. Paul writes of a righteousness of God which is to appear in the life of men. He says that it is possible only to men of faith; that it is only by it that man may hope to live the life of God; that it springs out of faith, and issues in faith. Faith is the microscopic cell buried in the heart of a seed: it is equally the heavy fruited bough, flung out to all the winds of heaven, nourishing out of its very substance the life of men.

In the study of spiritual powers we cannot afford to neglect that which we call 'FAITH.' We are not likely to get very far on in life's journey without being challenged to explain it. We are being challenged to-day. The secular Press discusses the question, and in the many letters which have appeared we have a clear indication of the deep-seated interest which belongs to the subject, and also of the mental confusion which follows upon all careless or inexact thinking upon this subject. There are many who desire to live the life of faith, but they are confused by the reflexion that the very faith which they seek is said to be the condition of attaining to the life of faith. 'How can I use that which I desire to obtain?' So cries the man in his perplexity. 'I see the beauty, the strength, the fruitfulness of the life of faith; I earnestly desire it; but the Church tells me that before I can get it I must use it. If I had it to use, should I desire it? Is this faith the cause or the product of the Christian life? Is it something with which I must start, or something with which I shall end?'

Paul's answer is that it is both. In order that we may the better understand this all-important statement in Christian teaching, we have thrown into

close proximity with this verse an incident taken from the Gospel. Paul gives us the philosophic statement; Mark describes the experience which declares its truth. There stands before the Christ a man with a withered arm. The limb hangs perfectly useless by his side. The nerves have ceased to act in the shrunken limb. Its muscles have atrophied; they no longer obey the command of the will. Movement has long since ceased to be possible. And Christ says, 'Stretch forth thy hand.'

We should find it easy to excuse the man if he had burst into the laugh that declares an embittered spirit. 'Stretch it out? Why, that is the very thing I have wanted to do all these years. If I could do it at all, would I have waited for your instructions? You are making what I need as a gift the condition of your giving. You must give me first some other power, and then there will be some chance of my doing what you say. Don't tell me to do what I want you to give me the power of doing.' Just for one moment the man stands looking into the quiet eyes of Him who knows both the innate powers and the sad paralysis of the human heart. Just for one moment; and then something stirred within the man. *It was the willingness to obey.* Only that: but how much it was! The nerves that had long since been utterly irresponsive, dead fibres of a useless limb, began to tingle, as once again there flowed along them the almost forgotten vibration. The feeble muscles obeyed, grew full and round again, and slowly the long palsied limb was lifted up, and into all its dry and desolate channels there came once more the blessed tide of life. That power to use his arm; was it a product or a cause? Did he not obey the initial impulse? Did he not receive the fuller power? His power sprang from his willingness to obey; it issued in the power to obey more perfectly. It was from faith; it was to faith. The final issue was life.

God's work is always such. He accepts life in the cell; He makes it the fertile mother of other life. He honours the neglected, the impaired, instrument, the uncertain possession of which first made us capable of receiving even the first impressions of spiritual life: He makes it the finished power which brings into the emptiness of man no less than the fulness of God; until in the faith, with which he began, man finds the very fulfilment of life. It brings to mind the children's

story of the giant's child whose groping hand closed upon its father's fingers, when the father's magic strength flooded the feeble fingers, until the child too had a giant's grasp and held its father in a grip from which the father could not escape. Our uncertain groping is so much of faith as makes us willing to obey. There is no man upon God's earth but may find the rudiments of that power in himself. Our giant's grasp is the same trust, obedience, faith—we may call it what we will—quicken by contact with God, thrilling with the energy of the Eternal, and 'neither life nor death nor any other creature shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Ro 8³⁹).

The power is from faith; it began in 'the obedience of faith' (Ro 1⁵). It is to faith. It issues in peace and power, in right conduct, in joy, in the enthusiasm of sacrifice, in fruitfulness. It becomes the sum of all that we call 'life.' The righteous man finds that his life has come from, out of, his faith (ἐκ πίστεως).

Faith is obedience. That is the teaching with which Paul begins and ends his greatest Epistle (Ro 1⁵ 16²⁶). And in this teaching we find the clue that leads us out of our modern labyrinth. In it faith is seen to be—

The submission of man's nothing perfect to God's all-complete,

As by each new obeisance in spirit I climb to His feet.
BROWNING, 'Saul.'

But St. Paul is not content with the beginnings of faith, and he speaks of its effects as only St. John of New Testament writers does. He describes it as seen in that enthusiastic personal adhesion of the individual to Christ which makes him one with his Lord, and he says it is realized in that spiritual communion which is our eternal life. Faith is the trust of the impotent man: it is also the passion of St. Paul (Gal 2²⁰).

Spiritual obedience is not mere outward conformity to laws external to ourselves: it is spiritual conformity to that of God which speaks within our hearts, when Deep calleth unto Deep, and God makes His appeal to the human heart. But that conformity, beginning as it does in obedience, issues in the reproduction in us of the note that makes the music of the world.

We are in danger of making the religious life into the working of a piece of machinery. The

mechanical view of life, so common to-day, is a danger that threatens to destroy its beauty in robbing it of its vitality. The round of observances, the cold and lifeless performance, the dull and dismal round of service accepted with so much complaisance or complaint, these are things which one might build a machine to perform. They do not indicate the heart with its glow, its passion, its tenderness, its love (Jn 5³⁹). There is no life in it; and thus it is that the years bring no mellow-ness; activity is never beautified by the grace of unselfishness; the outlook never widens; everything is bounded by the formal and narrow confines within which the machine first found its place. And the projected issue of such a life closely corresponds. The man has before him a crown, a harp, a paradise almost wholly material.

Heaven is nothing of that kind. If it were, men of noble spirit would prefer this life, with its warm tears of sympathy, with the many exultations of its simple joys. But the pity of it all! Men would develop a spirit with that which is material, and would find a motive in what is but dead machinery.

'Tis life, whereof our nerves are scant,
More life, and fuller, than we want.

TENNYSON, 'Two Voices.'

Is it so very far from us? The appeal of our Lord is always in our ears: 'He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.' Says Emerson: 'The whole course of things goes to teach us faith. Our one need is to obey, and by lowly listening—a beautiful rendering of ὑπακοή = obedience—by lowly listening we shall hear the right word, the word that gives us life.'

The simple act in which we take Christ at His word, the self-abandonment in which we 'let ourselves go,' that we may obey Him,—that is ever the beginning of life; and the end, the reward—if we must have it so—is that act made the rule, the description of our life. The initial act becomes the constant law. Obedience becomes enthusiasm. We begin by obeying the first feeble movement of the life of Christ within us; we end by reproducing in truth, in power, and in joy, the perfect life of God. He lives in us; we 'feed upon him in our heart by faith with thanksgiving.' Until at last the consummation of life is reached, and in man there appears the righteousness of God.

The trouble of our life is that that great end is so far away. Our crowning and constant discontent

is our own impotence, our personal failure to conform to God as we have seen Him in the face of Jesus Christ. We fail in the answer of our own hearts to that heavenly beauty. But as once more we stand before Him, and all the palsy that years of sloth and sin have wrought make us limp and helpless, impotent, faith will obey, even when she

sees no power of obedience in herself. We shall take Him at His word, and that word shall become the expression of our life. He is the author and the finisher of our faith, and at last upon our uplifted brows He will write the name that shall describe our life; and that name shall be His Own (Rev 3¹² 22⁴).

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XVIII. 8.

'I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily. Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily.'—'Quickly,' without delay—*celeriter* (a), *confestim* (d), *cito* (Vulg.). Although He bears long, and to those who are suffering seems to delay, yet He really acts speedily. This interpretation is confirmed by Ac 12⁷ 22¹⁸ 25⁴, Ro 16²⁰, 1 Ti 3¹⁴, Rev 1¹ 22⁶. Others prefer *repente*, *inopinato*. Thus Godet says, that although God delays to act, yet, when the moment comes, He acts swiftly, as at the Deluge and the destruction of Sodom. In any case the *ἐν τάχει* (speedily) is placed last with emphasis.—PLUMMER.

As when 'His soul was grieved for the misery of Israel' (Jg 10¹⁶), so 'His bowels are troubled' for His own elect, crying to Him day and night from the depths of their oppressions. He is pained, as it were, at the long delay which His wisdom sees necessary, and at the sore trial to which it puts their faith; and is impatient, so to speak, till 'the time, the set time,' arrive to interpose.—BROWN.

'Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?'—The interrogative particle *ἂρα* is to be accented thus (not *ἄρα*), as bearing a major force of reasoning, and interrogative. The two words are one in essence, but *ἂρα* has more emphasis in utterance, and therefore the first syllable is lengthened.—BRUCE.

'THE necessary faith, the faith in question, faith in Jesus as the Messiah and Saviour.' Others prefer 'the faith which perseveres in prayer,' or again 'loyalty to Himself,' which is much the same as faith in Christ. The answer to this desponding question, which seems, but only seems, 'to call in question the success of our Lord's whole mediatorial work,' has been given by anticipation (17²⁶): the majority, not only of mankind but of Christians, will be absorbed in worldly pursuits, and only a few will 'endure to the end' (Mt 24^{12, 13}). No doubt is expressed or implied as to the coming of the Son of Man, but only as to what He will find. There is therefore no reason for conjecturing that the parable received its present form at a time when belief

in the Second Advent was waning. Still less reason is there for interpreting it of the Christian Church seeking help from pagan magistrates against Jewish persecutors, and then concluding that it must have been composed after the time of St. Luke (De Wette). On the other hand, Hilgenfeld sees in the thirst for vengeance, which (he thinks) inspires the parable, evidence of its being one of the oldest portions of the Third Gospel.—PLUMMER.

THE SERMON.

The Faith of the Church.

By the Rev. James Owen.

In the end of the preceding chapter, Jesus spoke of a sudden and fearful judgment that would befall men. And the disciples asked Him, 'Where, Lord?' 'Where and on whom is this judgment to come?' He answered them, 'Where-soever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together.' As the carcass attracts the vultures, so does moral guilt demand the judgment. It was as if Christ had said, you need not ask where or when or how the judgment will take place, but remember wherever death and corruption are, thither must the vultures come. Life, then, is the only security against this judgment, and the condition of life is communion with God. To live always, men ought always to pray. To impress on the disciples the necessity of prayer, Christ then told them the Parable of the Importunate Widow, and ended it with the promise that if the elect cried to God, He would 'avenge them speedily.' And then comes this question, 'Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' and it seems to cast a gloom over the future. Is the time not coming, then, that has been prophesied when 'all

men shall know the Lord? Is there a doubt as to the perpetuity of faith on the earth? To understand the saying, we must notice two things. First, that the words do not necessarily mean the Son of Man's last coming to judgment. Any crisis in the history of an individual, or a family, or a Church, or a nation, we may speak of as a coming of the Son of Man. And, second, Christ does not suggest the extinction of all faith on the earth, but the possible weakening of the faith illustrated in the parable, the faith that can persevere though deliverance is delayed—not faith, but 'this faith.'

i. *Let us consider the importance attached by Christ to the faith of His people.*—The form of the question implies this. 'Shall he find faith?' He will be looking for it, as a man looks for some valuable treasure.

The faith of the Church is important, because it is at the root of all Christian activity. Great movements are the outcome of hearts on fire, not the result of logic. If we would have more apostolic enterprise in the Church of to-day, its trust in Christ and His word must be more complete. It is doubt that is the grave of zeal. Only let us have a greater faith, and then there will be enthusiasm.

ii. *Though the faith of the Church is tried by the delay of the deliverance, yet there are abundant reasons why it should hold on.*—Christ looking into the future saw clouds, persecution, corruption, eras of apparent retrogression and failure. Seeing this, He asked if the Church would become weary of the watching. The delay seems great, because the 'kingdom of God cometh not with observation.' It is gradual as the advance of spring. The most silent forces in the universe are the greatest. The train dashes on at forty-five miles an hour, and the noise is great; the earth is travelling at the rate of nineteen miles a second, and yet we hear no noise. The kingdom of God advances quietly; and slowly, as it seems to us. The change of religion, that which takes the deepest root in a man's nature, cannot take place in an hour. Yet let our faith hold on, for God is faithful. Nature proves Him so. Has He ever forgotten to bring the flowers in their season? His love to the Church is a reason why faith should not grow weary. God's love is deeper than a mother's; she may forget her child, yet 'I will not forget thee.'

Suppose the Son of Man came in our lifetime, what is the prospect? Some say it is very gloomy, that the faith that has stood for nineteen hundred years is to be swept away. Do not believe it. Wherever Christ is, there is progress; where He is not, there is stagnation and decay.

If the Son of Man came to-day in some great Reformation, who would be found watching? By this question, 'Shall he find faith on the earth?' He is calling us to watchfulness and importunity and patience. Christ is looking for our faith to-day. What does He see in us? To everyone personally He comes in death. If He thus came to you now, would He find you trusting in Him? O Spirit of Christ, breathe upon us and increase our faith!

The Hidden Issues.

By the Rev. Francis Paget, D.D.

The gospel of our Lord is, above all, a message of consolation. It discloses to us love, such as we never could have dreamt of, ruling over all things. In his inmost heart a Christian knows that to lose hope is to deny Christ. On the other hand, we find, side by side with words of infinite tenderness, a forecast so awful that we can hardly bear to think of it. The question—'When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?'—seems to suggest a doubt as to whether the spiritual history of the world may not end in a world-wide rejection of God.

1. In form the question expresses intense anxiety; in substance it concerns the first condition of a religious life. He who asks seems to be looking down the ages. He knows the weakness and treachery of men's hearts, and all the forces that make against faith. But he knows the love and steadfastness of God, the Rewarder of all who diligently seek Him. He may stay His hand for a while, but certainly He will not fail His people, nor can there be any change in His ready mercy and wondrous love. Notwithstanding all this, 'When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' When He comes again to the earth in glory, shall He find men answering to that great love of God, and daring to be unworldly for His sake? Or shall the Judge find a world that has discarded faith and hope and love and prayer?

2. The mere asking of such a question makes

us think. For it brings home to us the solemnity and arduousness of life. It is like looking beneath the beauty and wonder of this visible world and discovering strife and suffering—a battlefield as well as a landscape. Terrible as it is to think of abounding iniquity and failing faith, it is more terrible that such a change may go on quietly and secretly with no disturbance of ordinary interests. Christ warns us of this. When asked *when* and *where* the kingdom of God should come, He gave no explicit answer. Not with observation. Underneath all worldly concerns and pleasures the great issues of individual life are wrought out quietly, withdrawn from every eye save God's. And so it is with human life in general. The all-surpassing issue may be finding its decision along hidden ways, where God alone is watching it. No change may be visible, history may be progressing, and yet in the things God regards, events may be hurrying on to the last crisis of all. In the Cathedral of Orvieto there is a fresco painted by Luca Signorelli. It represents the appearance and triumphs of Antichrist. And 'Antichrist is no dreadful monster, but a grand and dignified figure, with a faint likeness to Him whose rival he is; noble in look and form, till you look into his face, and then the wickedness discloses itself.' So, amongst much that is dignified and brilliant, the things that belong to men's peace may be fading, and the dark cloud forming that caused the Saviour's question.

3. What use are we to make of such a question? If the growth or maintenance of faith were a matter of course, our Lord's question could hardly have been asked. The demands of a faithful life are high and constant. Amidst the clamour of the seen we must look to God, listen for His voice, and commit our way to Him.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

This faith, that he will avenge them speedily.—It was my privilege when pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, to preside at the fiftieth anniversary of the great American missionary to Turkey, Dr. Cyrus Hamlin. On that occasion he told us of an answer to prayer. In the year 1851, when Mahmud was Sultan of Turkey, he ordered the expulsion of all missionaries from the empire. The edict was final and irreversible. Dr. Hamlin, heartbroken and discouraged, said to William Goodell, 'Goodell, our lifework is a failure at the very start, for both the British and American Consuls say

the edict of expulsion must prevail, and we must go at once.'

Goodell replied: 'Hamlin, the Sultan of Heaven can change this; let us appeal to Him in prayer.'

So they gave themselves to prayer; they opened the edict and spread it before God; they prayed all night, for it seemed to them in their helplessness that their very destiny hung in the balance.

Well, what of it? This: the next day Mahmud died, and the edict of expulsion was never mentioned again.'—From David Gregg's *Individual Prayer as a Working Force*, p. 108. —F. W. ATKIN.

THE point at issue at the battle of Taunton, between the Duke of Monmouth and James II., in 1685, was liberty of worship; and although the Duke's small army, composed chiefly of miners and ploughmen, was defeated by the King's trained soldiers, yet a remnant that proved sufficient remained, and a faith and faithfulness remained in which we plainly see the meeting of God and man to carry out the event. And nowhere is this more apparent than in the case of Lady Alice Lisle, who after this battle gave shelter to two of the hunted soldiers—a minister and a lawyer.

On the following day her house was searched, the fugitives discovered, and Lady Lisle herself sent to prison. The judge who tried her was Jeffries, and he sentenced her to be burned. On the entreaty of friends, however, this cruel sentence was not carried out, and instead she was ordered to be beheaded, which cruel and unjust penalty she calmly suffered at Winchester. And before three years had passed, King James himself was a fugitive from his own kingdom, to which he never returned; while the infamous Jeffries was also captured, as he was attempting to escape from the country, and sent to the Tower, where he died four months after.

Faith and Action.—Upon a day in the sixteenth century, at Rome, some men bearing the title of Inquisitors were assembled to decree the immobility of the earth. A prisoner stood before them. His brow was illumined by genius. It was Galileo. The old man shook his old and venerable head. His soul revolted against the absurd violence of those who sought to constrain him to deny truths revealed to him by God. But his pristine energy was worn down by long suffering and sorrow; the monkish menace crushed him. He strove to submit. He raised his hand—he too—to declare the immobility of the earth. But as he raised his hand, he raised his weary eyes to that heaven they had searched throughout long nights to read thereon one line of universal law: they encountered a ray of that sun they so well knew, motionless amid the moving spheres. Remorse entered his soul; an involuntary cry burst from the believer's heart: *E pur se muove!* ('And yet it moves!')

Three centuries have passed away. Inquisitors, Inquisition, absurd theses imposed by force, all these have disappeared. Naught remains but the well-established movement of the earth and the sublime cry of Galileo floating above the ages. Child of humanity, raise thy brow to the sun of God, and read upon the heavens, 'It moves!' Faith and action! The future is ours.—MAZZINI.

FOR REFERENCE.

- Arnold (T.), *Sermons*, vol. v. 15.
 Gairdner (W. F.), *The Three Things that Abide*, 1.
 Henderson (A.), *The Measure of a Man*, 157.
 Ingram (A. F. W.), *Banners of the Christian Faith*, 1.
 Irving (E.), *Prophetical Works*, vol. ii. 678.
 Jones (J. C.), *The Welsh Pulpit of To-Day*, 185.
 Jowett (B.), *College Sermons*, 59.
 M'Combie (W.), *Sermons and Lectures*, 125.

- Mills (B. F.), *God's World*, 35.
 Myres (W. M.), *Fragments that Remain*, 67.
 Paget (F.), *Studies in Christian Character*, 89.
 Spurgeon (C. H.), *Our Lord's Parables*, No. 41.
 Vaughan (D. J.), *The Days of the Son of Man*, 1.
Church Pulpit Year-Book, vol. ii. (1905) 293.
 " " " " vol. iv. (1907) 272.
Three Hundred Outlines of Sermons on the New Testament, 581.

Social Theories and the Teaching of Jesus.

BY THE REV. D. MACFADYEN, M.A., HIGHGATE, LONDON.

III.

The Social Outlook of the Gospel.

THE social element in the teaching of Jesus is not a discovery of the nineteenth century. It is a seed always in the New Testament soil waiting for the right circumstances of season and atmosphere to grow and blossom. Men have felt in other ages than our own that to be identified with Christ was to be identified with a definite ideal of social conduct, a definite conception of social relations, and an attempt to realize a society not only redeemed but redeeming. The practical and hopeful disciple fresh from unhopd-for victories over the evil in himself, has refused to relegate the vision of the Kingdom of God to the region of the 'heroic for man too high.' No victory over selfishness is too great to hope for if it is to be won in the name of Christ. The deal is not the impossible: it is the perfect which is to complete the visibly imperfect. If the disciple cannot find the Kingdom of God he must help to create it. The repeated reappearance of some such spirit as this in the history of the Christian Church warrants us in regarding it as a natural product of the teaching and influence of our Lord. We may take as illustration two periods when, in a special sense, the minds of men came freshly to the evangel—the first Christian century and the sixteenth.

(a) The Church of Jerusalem as described in the second chapter of the Acts represents an early and enthusiastic attempt to establish a society which should exclude temptations to worldly living, eliminate selfishness, foster brotherliness,

and establish social relations between its members which should fit them for the millennial Kingdom of God which was daily expected. It cannot be quoted to illustrate the economic soundness of socialistic methods, for it developed into an eleemosynary community supported by the alms of generous individualists in other churches. [Ac 11^{29, 30}, 1 Co 16¹⁻⁴, 2 Co 8¹⁻⁴ 9^{1,2}.] But it may fairly be quoted in evidence if we want to know how Jesus was understood by His immediate hearers and disciples. While they felt the impress of His personality, and lived under the first generous impulse given by the incoming of His Spirit, they felt the necessity of creating a community-life of a new order. They 'continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and in fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers . . . and all who held faith (οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν) were of one mind, and continued to have all things common.'

It was not to be expected that so bold an experiment should succeed when first tried. The most exacting form of social life was not to be reached at a leap. The Ananias and Sapphira incident indicates that the human material was still in the rough, but the attempt made may be taken as proof that the disciples felt the compulsion of Christ upon them to make it. It was an economic experiment resting on a common 'faith.'

(b) The gospel of the Kingdom came again like a new light to the men of the sixteenth century. The light, indeed, had never wholly gone out in

the intervening time, but it had burned dimly beneath the shade of a vast dogmatic system, even when it was not purposely obscured by the weight of ecclesiastical authority. The New Testament, once in the hands of the people, was found to be full of luminous comment on social relations. Indeed, the common folk to whom Luther gave the New Testament in their own tongue, found in it something which carried them farther than the man who gave it. He set in operation the powers of grace and faith, and those who recognized these powers set them to work in the sphere where their interests lay. Their interests were in life, in freedom, in securing the conditions of mere manhood and womanhood. It would hardly have been natural had they been content to quarry from a New Testament which seemed to contain treasure present and eternal for themselves, mere bolts wherewith to pierce the joints of the Roman armour. There were matters more pressing on which Christ had evidently something to say. He had come to preach good tidings to the poor: they were poor.¹ He was sent to proclaim release to the captives: they were serfs. He had come 'announcing the gospel of God, and saying, . . . that the kingdom of heaven is at hand':² they still lived under the dominion of injustice, terror, oppression, rapacity. The evangel filled them with new hope—it set up the ferment of a Christ-inspired ideal. It is true that the leaders in the Peasants' War made fatal blunders. They proposed to verify their unworldly faith by appeal to grossly mundane weapons. They tried to initiate a regenerated society with bills and reaping-hooks matched against stone walls and mailed knights. It is a pathetic record of childlike—almost childish—faith wedded to futile heroism. But there is no doubt that their visionary hopes and revolutionary proposals were the direct product of their faith in Christ. Every claim they made rested on a promise of Christ. The preamble of their demands declared that they sought nothing which the gospel did not justify. The last article demanded that all the rest should be brought to the test of Scripture. They construed the gospel as the charter of a new society which was to end the wrongs of the old, and could not believe that their lords would accept it so far as it liberated them from Rome, and reject it when it dealt with other plague spots.

¹ Lk 4¹⁸.

² Mk 1¹⁴.

The Peasants' War failed, as the Church of Jerusalem did. It was premature, quixotic, hopeless. It did positive harm to the Reformation. It frightened Luther and threw him on to the side of the princes; made him an Erastian to prove that he was not a revolutionist. But it is not less decisive than our first witness as a proof that men who came freshly to the words of Christ, found in them an authoritative ideal of social relationships, and a real necessity laid upon them by their faith in Christ to create a community which should embody and express His will.

(c) Other movements with the same aim followed the failure of the peasants' insurrection. The attempt to follow utterly the principles of the teaching of Christ led to the establishment of various communities on socialistic lines. Some are still existent;³ others fell a prey to the folly of individuals or the temptation of antinomian extravagance.⁴ An exhaustive list of such communities would be full of interest, biographical and economic. It would have to include the religious societies of the commonwealth, the history of the Moravian settlements, the Quaker and similar communities which have taken root in the virgin soil of America.

But numbers add nothing to the argument. Indeed, it is hardly necessary to argue that there are social implications in faith in Christ. Whether we turn to the record of other days or watch the working of the Christian teacher in a city court or alley, we find that when men first feel the touch of the spirit of Christ upon them they feel an obligation to create a new social environment in which the redeemed soul can live according to the new principles of life it has received. They instinctively reject the habits and relations to which they have been accustomed. They want other habits and relations, and alas! in seeking them, often enough fall under the spell of traditions of respectability which are different from their own, but hardly better in the sense of being more vitally Christian. They rise a step in society, but not always a step nearer the Kingdom of God.

(d) The Christian Socialist movement of our own time thus falls into line with a long series of others stretching back to the Church of Jerusalem. Our 'return to Christ,' which is the most hopeful of all

³ E.g. the Schwenkfeldians in America.

⁴ Cf. the Munster Anabaptists.

signs of the times, has brought us again to a fresh appreciation of the New Testament message. It has reminded us of the social implications of faith in Christ. The discovery that Christ came not to teach a creed so much as to create life of a certain type, has made us restless. Our dogmas seem to distract attention from some things which are of prime importance. We are dissatisfied with a social organization which, from a Christian point of view, seems very like social disorganization. It seems to discourage some of the virtues essentially Christian, and it offers immense premiums to the cultivation of some very unchristian vices, such as self-assertion, avarice, cunning, selfishness. There is an uneasy feeling that the moral basis of our commercial life is profoundly insecure. We are re-examining our 'fundamentals' with some anxiety. A German socialist has said that 'whoever would understand the social question and contribute to its solution must have upon his right hand the works of political economy, on his left the works of scientific socialism, and must keep the New Testament open before him.'¹ The saying illustrates well the temper and method in which many men in all churches are looking hopefully for some means of breathing a new and more wholesome spirit into the economic and social relationships of our complex national life. The main contribution to a saner social condition must be ethical. It will come from more strenuous loyalty to Christ and a better understanding of what is involved in that loyalty. Political economy is bringing keener insight into the forces which act in society to-day. Insight stimulates criticism. Economic science is becoming a study of the causes of poverty rather than a study of the causes of wealth. Scientific socialism is incessantly employed in the endeavour to work out the economic ideal, which would be the correlative of a more wholesome ethical condition.

It is hardly possible to sum up briefly and in a scientific shape the points in the teaching of Jesus on which Christian Socialists rely for their reading of the gospel. That is because the teaching of Jesus is neither scientific nor systematic. It proceeds from individual to individual, from question to question, from case to case. It is only when we put together parable and incident and epigram that we feel our way into the general conception

¹ Herr Todt, *Radical German Socialism and Christian Society*.

and the unifying purpose behind the particular sayings.²

By way of illustration and suggestion rather than with any intention of exhausting the subject, we may put together some of the sayings which deal with three vital points of social life: (1) personal relations, (2) property, (3) the social end.

1. *Personal Relations*.—Jesus taught men to enter society in a certain spirit. 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do also to them.'³ We owe to all men an *equality of consideration*. Each man is to be treated as an end in himself in the same sense as we are ends to ourselves. No man is merely a means to the life of another.⁴

The disciple is to go among men in a spirit of profound humility, ready to give place to others, reverencing the poor, feeling for the weak who go to the wall (Mt 5^{3, 5, 7}, Lk 6²⁰ 14⁷⁻¹¹). No man can be trusted to insist on his rights except he who is ready to give them up (Mt 5³⁸⁻⁴²). The most vital right secured by the Christian society to its members is the right to do good, and so long as that is inviolate other 'rights' are to be reckoned unimportant (Lk 6^{9, 27-38}). Jesus put His own construction on the word 'neighbour.' His commentary on the word in a famous parable is the germ of a gospel of neighbourhood which is now the clamant need of many of our great cities. He sets the word 'brother' free from its bondage to a physical relationship, and makes it include all realized spiritual relationship. The man who in Christ discovers his sonship to the Eternal Father has come into a family as large as God's own, and owes fraternal duties to all its members.

We are to cherish a deliberate optimism about men. We are to despair of no man (Lk 10³⁴). Consideration for all, brotherhood towards all, love to the brethren, humility as to personal claims, hope for all, are some of the characteristics which are to mark personal relations in the Christian society.

² This has been done recently in several different ways with varying success. Cf. Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*. Horton has put Wendt in English dress. F. H. Stead has a convenient summary in his manual, *The Kingdom of God*. *Ecce Homo* is still among the best of books for this subject. Cf. also Washington Gladden's books, and Shailer Mathews' *The Social Teaching of Jesus*.

³ Mt 7¹².

⁴ For an admirable Christian statement of the Kantian doctrine, see Gore, *Social Teaching of the Sermon on the Mount*.

A mere enumeration such as this, of marks of the Christian spirit in social relations, is a severe criticism on a 'cash nexus,' which yields the minimum of individual consideration. The Christian ideal reads like a deliberate condemnation of a competitive system which identifies 'success' with the prosperity of one at the cost of the sacrifice of many. The final condemnation of the competitive system is not that it is competitive but that it may so easily end in monopoly—which is the sacrifice of all in the interest of one. Any system is finally condemned which offers neither function nor consideration to many of the units which compose society.

But if the Christian disciple is to enter society in the spirit indicated, there must be a society for him to enter which will not treat him as a fool and send him, at last, to the workhouse or the asylum, as the prey of rogues or the sport of fools. The social organization which Jesus contemplated was one in which every man might live on condition of discharging his function. The birds of the air fulfil their part in the scheme of nature, and are provided for. The lilies fulfil their part, and they lack no beauty; they attain their end. Every human life has its place to fill in a wholesome society. Security of work is as necessary as security of life. The labourer is worthy of his hire. There are no unemployed 'classes' or 'masses.' It is the part of each and of all to see that in the individual life God's will is done in and through it, and by a perfectly natural process the discharge of function will secure the material basis of life.

A moralized society would discourage and protect itself if possible against whatever militates against this natural condition of things. It would suppress the monopolist who masters the market and will not let others live, and the speculator who rigs the market to his own advantage. It would punish equally the anti-social habits of the idle rich and the idle poor. It would protect itself against all who by selfish ownership of instruments of production prevent others from the discharge of useful function.

2. *Property.*—Very significant for our time is our Lord's dealing with the idea of personal property. The characteristic word of that teaching is the word 'steward.' When He wanted to illustrate the prudent use of worldly wealth He did so

in the parable of the unjust steward.¹ When He spoke of the wise use of authority He described 'the faithful and wise steward' (Lk 12^{41, 42}). Property was to be construed as responsibility rather than privilege. It was to be regarded as bringing more duties than dignities (Lk 12⁴⁸). A man has not a right to do what he wills with his own, but only a right to do what God wills. The man who accumulates wealth as a means of self-gratification is the one man who is supremely a fool (Lk 12²⁰). The man who owns without using what he has as responsible to the Giver of all, is the 'unprofitable servant,' to be cast into the outer darkness. In an unchristian society the pre-eminent in wealth or position wield authority, in the Christian society they are eminent only in service (Mt 25³⁰).

These sayings are sufficiently definite to constitute a specific Christian doctrine about private property. There is a definite limit to the right of acquiring property, and that limit is the power of using every part of it according to the Master's will. It cuts at the root of exclusive ownership. What the world calls ownership it calls stewardship. That is at least as important as the Christian 'doctrine of baptism.' Is it unreasonable to claim that it should be taught as definitely? Were it as generally accepted and as much insisted on, the kingdom of heaven would be appreciably more visible.

Although Christian Socialism like State Socialism does not recognize absolute ownership, the positions are, of course, distinct. State Socialism would recognize no property in instruments of production, and, if necessary, would take what it regards as necessary for the community. The New Testament recognizes individual property, for no man can exercise the Christian duty of being generous unless he has something of his own. But it recognizes no proprietorship for purely selfish purposes. The plant of human nature is allowed soil for its roots: there its just claim ends. A man may have and keep what is necessary for developing personal character and family life, but he is to hold that and all besides only for the sake of the common good. The end for which he holds it determines the conditions under which he will exercise his proprietary rights.

In the sixteenth century, certain German anabaptists who were led to the stake for their

¹ Lk 16¹⁻¹³.

revolutionary tendencies, were asked to state their heretical opinion about the 'community of goods.' They replied that their idea of 'community of goods' was 'that a Christian ought to stand free and indifferent to all his property, ready to share with a brother in need.' The words express well enough the construction which Christian Socialism has put upon the teaching of Christ about property. They are revolutionary enough, but not in the sense sometimes attributed to them. The socialism of force relies upon the compulsion of force to produce its community of goods. The socialism which is of Christ relies upon the compulsion of Christian faith and loyalty to produce a like result at last.

3. *The Social End.*—The teaching of Jesus about the possession of property is of one piece with His teaching about wealth as a social 'end.' If plain words could have guarded disciples against the desire of gain they should have been beyond the temptation of living for wealth. 'Woe unto you that are rich!' (Lk 6²⁴). 'Woe unto you that are full now, for ye shall hunger' (Lk 6²⁵). 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!' (Mk 10²³). 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon' (Mt 6²⁴). These and words like them are a direct warning against the perils of the counting-house and the exchange. They are deliberately intended to warn His followers that—

'Gold if it stick
Unto thy fingers, woundeth to the quick.'

They seem to hedge in the Christian life in order to compel it to choose some other purpose for life than the getting of gain. The purse of the disciple is to be of the kind that 'waxes not old,' because by a natural law the heart is bound to that which is the heart's treasure (Lk 12^{33, 34}). A man's life does not consist in possessing an abundance of things (Lk 12¹⁵). These are the complements of that other saying which states the social 'end' positively: 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.'

Before the first age of the Church had passed away, the apostles had discovered that the temptation to accumulate wealth was to be the special temptation of their converts. Their habits were frugal: as they withdrew from other passions and pursuits, the love of riches became more fascinating. They grew rich. But the apostles felt that

the development was out of all harmony with the spirit of their Master. They met it with protest and rebuke. James repeated the woes for the wealthy which he had heard first on the lips of his Brother and Lord (Ja 5¹⁻⁶). In the First Epistle to Timothy we have a brief summary of the teaching of one who claimed to 'have the mind of Christ.' 'They that desire to be rich fall into a temptation and many foolish and hurtful lusts, such as drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all kinds of evil, which some reaching after, have been led astray from the faith, and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows' (1 Ti 6^{9, 10}).

This is very plain speech. It ought to have a very definite effect in creating the tone of a Christian society in its attitude to wealth and men of wealth. The case which suggests itself as a parallel is that of intemperance. The love of alcohol is a 'root of all kinds of evil.' But men of Christian principle have never taken the extreme position that all intoxicating drinks are necessarily an evil. The facts on which such a conclusion may rest are medical: the question must be settled on scientific grounds. But in spite of all arguments as to the 'good gifts of nature,' Christian people have recognized the need of emphatic protest against the abuse of alcohol. We are agreed that if wine causeth a brother to stumble we will drink no wine while the world standeth. As a protest against the national vice of drunkenness many abstain; others are careful to be conspicuously moderate. But the teaching of Jesus is much more decisive as to the danger of wealth than as to the danger of alcohol. In one case our protest rests only on an inference, in the other it may rest on a direct command. It is not necessary to take an Ebionite position and say that material possessions are necessarily bad. In the hands of a conspicuously good man they might be conspicuously good. It is—according to our Lord—possible for God to guard the heart even of a rich man from the danger of his wealth; but it is important to recognize that no one else can. His position is like that of a man who keeps a spirit shop and has in his blood an hereditary tendency to drunkenness.

What is required is that as society comes under the spell of the authority of Christ it should recognize this great peril. The desire of gain is as great a danger to the life of the individual Christian and to the Christian society, as a whole, as the passion

for drink. It demands an equally strong protest. The trades which make profit out of the demoralization of humanity would be easily ended if they were not so profitable. The Augean stables would be easily cleansed did it not pay so well to keep them foul.

Men are wanted who will deliberately decide not to make money, not to seek wealth, but to put their strongest energies into human service, to carry on commerce as the doctor who practises amongst the poor carries on the work of his profession—satisfied to do a good turn to those with whom they deal and to get only a 'living wage.' *The social end must be well-being, not wealth, or wealth only so far as it can be made commonwealth.* This is the demand made long ago by Christ Himself: 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness.'

Much more might be said. The bearings of the words of Christ on social life and social relations are very many. We have mentioned only three: the Christian doctrine as to personal relations, the Christian doctrine of property, and the Christian view of the social end, but these are fundamental. They suggest a conception of a Christian society which has still to be created. They warrant re-

peated endeavours to realize the ideal suggested. They make a solid basis for the work of a Christian Socialism which aims at the improvement of society by a Christian society. It is impossible to doubt that the reformatory and creative power of such a Christianized society would be far greater than that of the separate individuals who form it. A cathedral is something more than the separate stones of which it is built. Its power to still the fretful spirit into awe and reverence, its dignity and imaginative appeal, do not exist until the stones become the embodied idea of the architect—the expression of one reverent idea and worshipful purpose. An individualistic Christianity quarries and polishes the separate stones. It does not give form to the idea of the great Architect. To get that idea in all its power, to see the purpose of Christ for the world taking effect, we must have not only Christian individuals but a Christianized society. The individual is not reached only by an appeal to him as an individual; he may be drawn and fascinated by the vision of an ordered whole, an organization of life, a society moulded into harmony and dignity of relation, redeemed out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of the sun of God's love.

Literature.

THE PASTORAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

THE PASTORAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL: HIS MINISTERIAL IDEALS. By W. Edward Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc. (*T. & T. Clark*, 1907. 7s. 6d. net.)

DR. Chadwick is favourably known to many by his *Social Teaching of St. Paul*, and it is matter for congratulation that we have now received a volume from his pen upon the Apostle's pastoral teaching. As Matthew Arnold foresaw, 'the reign of the real St. Paul is only beginning'; the press now teems with works upon his life, his travels, his gospel, his theology. But there was room for a book, at once scholarly and practical, which should exhibit him as a model of the pastoral life; and this place has been filled in no small measure by Dr. Chadwick's new book.

As the writer himself remarks, it may seem

strange that in a treatise on St. Paul's pastoral teaching no use has been made of the Pastoral Epistles. But the decision to exclude them is probably wise. The letters to the Churches reveal more of the pastor's heart than those which are concerned with the technicalities of the pastoral care; in the former we are able to discern principles and methods, motives and sources of strength, while the latter are largely occupied with details which are of less interest to the present age. In the letters to the Churches, under the welcome guidance of Dr. Chadwick, we discern the Apostle's conceptions of the Christian pastor and his pastoral work; we see him at his work of teaching, we hear him interceding for the flock; we gather the secret of his devotion, and the nature of the wisdom on which he relies. All this is drawn out from St. Paul's own words, by a careful study of the text; and, this done, the results are applied with no

ordinary skill to the needs of the modern guide of souls.

We have not often met with a book which we should so gladly see placed in the hands of the younger clergy. As a study of St. Paul's Epistles from a particular point of view it has considerable value, calling attention to the profit which the clergy may gain by going again and again to the familiar text of the Greek New Testament in the expectation of finding there new light for their daily duties. But Dr. Chadwick's work is more than a study of St. Paul; it is also incidentally a study of the present requirements and opportunities of the pastoral office. The wants of the Church in this twentieth century are never out of sight, and the reader knows himself to be in the hands of a wise and experienced guide. We are persuaded that the Church would be stronger and more successful in her great work, if the counsels and the inspiration which this book draws from the pastoral teaching of St. Paul were more generally realized by those who are called in these days to feed the flock of God.

H. B. SWETE.

Cambridge.

JEYE BEE.

LETTERS OF DR. JOHN BROWN. Edited by his Son and D. W. Forrest, D.D. (*A. & C. Black.* 10s. 6d. net.)

The author of *Rab and his Friends* has taken a place in the history of literature far higher than his literary gift alone would have secured him. He has taken so high a place that every scrap which he ever wrote, including the most perfunctory letter on the most trivial subject, is printed and published, and read with avidity. And this is not because he was a greater man intellectually than his writings. It is because he was a better man. It is because he was genial, sympathetic, humorous. There are innumerable pleasantries in these letters, such as the fancy to sign his name Jeye Bee. And for the sake of such things the letters have been gathered together. There are glimpses also of Thackeray and Ruskin and other great men, and letters from them—letters from which nobody would judge that they were so great; for all mankind put off its frills when it came into contact with Jeye Bee.

One of the pleasantest letters in the book is all about the death of a dog. In this letter occurs the only serious misprint we have discovered. The

editors print the end of it, 'I shall never see that dear four-footed friend; and it is all my own fault. I never did.' It ought to be: 'I shall never see that dear four-footed friend; and it is all my own fault I never did.' Here is the letter:

'23 Rutland Street, May 18th, 1857.

'MY DEAR COVENTRY,—Mr. Peddie told me to-day that you have lost Wamba. I know too well what this is to think it anything less than a great sorrow. I would not like to tell almost anybody how much I have felt in like circumstances. The love of the dumb, unfailing, happy friend is so true, so to be depended on, is so free of what taints much of human love, that the loss of it ought never to be made light of. Had he been unwell for some time? He was not old enough to die of age. We have one such, and I don't know what Madam and I would do were he to die. How are you, and why did you never come here? Write me soon. There are many things I would like to ask you about, and some day I may take a run down and see you. I shall never see that dear four-footed friend; and it is all my own fault I never did.—Yours ever,

'J. BROWN.'

The book is a mixture of the grave and the gay, and the grave is very grave and the gay very gay, yet the one never makes the other ludicrous. They have both their place in a full life, and Dr. John Brown's life was full to overflowing.

THE CITIES OF ST. PAUL.

THE CITIES OF ST. PAUL. By W. M. Ramsay, Kt., Hon. D.C.L., etc., Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* 12s.)

Sir William Ramsay is not merely a geographer. He describes the cities of St. Paul, but he describes them in order to let us understand (as he says on his title-page) their influence on St. Paul's life and thought. He is an expositor. Whether it is some book of the New Testament or some other early Christian writing, there is always some document in his hand when he goes out to see and when he sits down to write. And when he has made the meaning of that early document clearer or its trustworthiness more assured, he feels that he has fulfilled something of the work which God has

given him to do. The mere geographer will not despise Sir William Ramsay or neglect him. But Sir William Ramsay himself would be ill-content if the only profit from his work were found in the region of art and science. He deliberately determines that it shall serve the interests of the Kingdom. By whatever road he has come (and we freely admit that it has not been by 'the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery'), he has come to be a preacher of righteousness.

But useful as this volume will be to the student of the Word, indispensable as it will be to the fully furnished preacher, its interest is not exhausted by them. The geographer, as we have said, will quote Ramsay now as his first authority. The lexicographer will mark his pages with pencil, and transfer the markings to his next New Testament grammar. The politician will welcome the abundance of new light that is cast on Roman government and Greek political institution. The historian of Asia Minor will recognize that Ramsay's discoveries and deductions have made it necessary that the history of this period should be written over again from the beginning.

Of Sir William Ramsay's use to the expositor a good example is found in the way in which he brings together Acts 21³⁹ and Rom. 16⁷⁻²¹. In the former passage St. Paul declares that he is a free-born Roman citizen. That could be in only one way. There must have been a considerable body of Jews in Tarsus, and they must have been enrolled as a 'Tribe,' for otherwise they could not have remained Jews. This supposition is confirmed by Rom. 16⁷⁻²¹, where six persons are spoken of by St. Paul as his 'kinsmen.' They could hardly be kinsmen by birth, 'for there is reason to think that the family to which the Apostle belonged had not come over to the Christian Church in such numbers, but rather had condemned his action, and had rejected him.' Nor can it simply mean 'Jews'; for other Jews are mentioned in this passage without any such epithet. Professor Ramsay believes that these 'Kinsmen' were members of the same 'Tribe' in Tarsus.

This volume describes the Pauline cities of Asia Minor. Another will come for Europe. It is illustrated with cuts of coins and with photographs, and it contains four maps, which are not merely a convenience, but bring the geography up to date.

LUCRETIVS.

LUCRETIVS: EPICUREAN AND POET. By
John Masson, M.A., LL.D. (Murray.
12s. net.)

Dr. Masson has identified himself with Lucretius. Those who think of Dr. Masson, think of Lucretius; those who think of Lucretius now, think of Dr. Masson. To the lay mind Homer and Gladstone once were so united; this conjunction has not yet got hold of the lay mind, but it is always present to the scholar.

Dr. Masson has now written the very best book that has been written on Lucretius. And that is nearly as much as to say that he has written the best book ever written for the exposition of a classical author. For Lucretius has had the good fortune to attract to him three or four of the greatest intellects that ever gave themselves to the exposition of an ancient writing. The schoolboy adores Munro; the scholar places Lambinus and Lachmann beside him.

There were three editions of Munro's *Lucretius*, and in each edition there was an advance in understanding and in appreciation. Dr. Masson advances distinctly beyond the latest edition of Munro. For much work has been done on Lucretius since 1873, and he himself has been studying the poet every day. There are discoveries also which have to be reckoned with—the discovery of the Borgian Life of Lucretius (made by Dr. Masson himself), and the discovery of radium! Yes, of radium, for is not Lucretius the advocate of the Atomic Theory, and may not radium modify all our ideas of atoms? Then Dr. Masson enjoys the blessing of detachment. He is bound to no creed or theory. He is a student of Lucretius. He seeks to understand the poet, not to excommunicate him. And so he is able to get the very best out of him and leave the rest of us to take Lucretius to our heart or cast him out of our company.

Yet he is not forgetful of the difficulty of mastering the poet's meaning, or of measuring his philosophy, or even of reading his lines for any length of time at a sitting. He would have us believe, however, that these difficulties have been exaggerated. He tells a story of Professor Wilkie of St. Andrews, 'a man with a touch of genius, who, before Burns, wrote poems in Lowland Scots. He had a great admiration for Lucretius. Across the street there lived a shoemaker, famous for his

skill on the violin. Wilkie used to say, "Lucretius minds me aye on John Tamson. John keeps hammerin' at a sole a' the day, dunt! dunt! dunt! but whiles he lays down the sole an' taks up the fiddle like this"—swinging his elbow—"and, man, it's rael bonny."

GEORGE MATHESON.

THE LIFE OF GEORGE MATHESON. By D. Macmillan, M.A., D.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. 6s.)

Dr. George Matheson wrote about the Representative Men of the New Testament. Let the word be extended to embrace the New Covenant, and Dr. Matheson himself may be taken as one of the representative men. He gave them titles—'Nicodemus the Instructed,' 'Mark the Steadied,' 'Barnabas the Chastened.' What title shall we give himself? Shall we not call him Matheson the Seeing? He has been popularly known in Scotland for a generation as 'the blind preacher'; but the thing which most astonished those who knew him best was that he saw so clearly and so far.

He was born in Glasgow in 1842, the year before the Disruption. From his father he inherited his tireless energy and unmistakable business capacity. From his mother he received all that made him ours—the restless intellect, the imagination, the spiritual vision. He was not born blind. But by the time that he entered the logic class in the University of Glasgow the disease at the back of the eye had worked its will so far that for all practical purposes eyesight was gone. He was then in his eighteenth year. How did it affect him? Some thought it never affected him at all. They knew him buoyant and inspiring. They called him a convinced optimist. But there was an hour, says his biographer, when he stood face to face with the appalling fact that life was before him, and that he would have to go through it maimed. He realized that he had lost that faculty which brought him most immediately into touch with human interests, that faculty which opened the door of human knowledge; and no man ever pursued after knowledge more ardently, or threw himself more whole-heartedly into the life of his fellow-men. In the after years, when honours were thick upon him, and he was commanded to preach before Her Majesty the Queen at

Balmoral, he took for his topic the problem of the Book of Job. It was the problem he had faced in his early youth, and it was with him always.

His career at the University was distinguished. His sisters helped him. Two of them learned those languages which we call dead, that they might read to him Homer and Virgil, and even Isaiah. When he entered the ministry of the Church of Scotland, and was called to the parish of Innellan, his eldest sister wrote out his earliest sermons to his dictation. She had taught him the alphabet when he was an infant. She encouraged him afterwards to learn a new alphabet, which goes by the name of the Braille, twice putting into his hands the key of knowledge.

He wrote poetry. One poem will survive. It is that hymn which is winning its way into all the collections, and is now sung throughout the world,—one might say on alternate Sunday evenings with Newman's 'Lead, kindly Light.' Both hymns owe much to their music. Matheson's 'O Love that wilt not let me go' has the advantage over Newman's 'Lead, kindly Light,' that it is always sung to its own tune. But both are true poems, and it must not be forgotten that, although so many hymns seem to live without being poetry, the hymn which is a poem is a greater favourite with the common people.

He wrote books also. We know his books. They too will last. We called him 'Matheson the seeing.' 'There were times,' says Dr. Macmillan, 'when his friends thought that he not only saw them, but saw through them. This must have been Mr. Eric Mackay's experience, for, when visiting Dr. Matheson, along with his foster-sister, Marie Corelli, he suddenly paused in the midst of his conversation and remarked, "You have a penetrating eye, Dr. Matheson."' But it was his books that gave us his title. They are mostly devotional. And it is probably to Dr. Matheson we owe it that the conception of a devotional book has been wholly altered in our day. The devotional book was formerly a product of the heart, and the more devotional the less the head had to do with it. Dr. Matheson made it a product of the person. Every sentence carries a thought from the head, as well as an impulse from the heart. 'I will love the Lord,' he said, 'with all my heart, and soul, and strength, and mind.'

THE LITERATURE AND RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

THE POST-EXILIC PROPHETS. By W. H. Bennett, Litt.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, New College, London. (T. & T. Clark. 6s. net.)

This is the first published volume of a new series which goes by the name of 'The Religion and Literature of Israel.' As the editor states, the idea of the series originated with Professor Skinner, of Cambridge. Professor Skinner also suggested the men to whom the various portions of the Old Testament should be assigned. We do not honestly think that better men could have been found. And they all accepted the offer at once. It would have been an ideal accomplishment if the volumes had appeared in chronological order. But it is doubtful if it would have served any really practical purpose. Men would have given themselves, after all, to the study of the volume in which they were interested at the moment. It is expected that the next volume will be that on the Pre-Exilic Prophets, by Dr. R. H. Kennett, Regius Professor of Hebrew in Cambridge. With its publication the whole of the Prophets will be in our hands. When the series is complete it will be possible, if not by reading right through the whole, at least by following certain ideas, to trace the development of the religion of Israel from the very earliest times to the time of Christ. This will be a profitable exercise for the student of religion.

But the probability is that the volumes will be used chiefly for teaching purposes—for carrying a Bible class over a definite period, or as the basis of popular lecture. There must be few Bible-class teachers, perhaps there are few preachers now, who altogether ignore the difference between one portion of literature and another in the Old Testament, and the difference of the religious ideas which the writers present. The time is past when men were afraid to suggest such differences in case their doctrine of inspiration should suffer. It is by comparison that education proceeds. The comparison of one writer with another, or of the contents of one portion of literature with the contents of another, such as the Psalms and the Wisdom Literature, is the only way in which the Bible can be really studied.

Professor Bennett's book is a student's book; perhaps even more than that, a teacher's book. It is entirely reliable, and it is full of matter.

Among the Books of the Month.

From the Cambridge University Press there comes *A Life of Bishop Burnet* (15s. net). The book is divided into two parts, as the life was—'Scotland, from 1643 to 1674,' being written by the Rev. T. E. S. Clarke, B.D., minister of Saltoun, and 'England, 1674 to 1715,' by Miss H. C. Foxcroft. It contains also an Introduction of thirty-six pages, by Mr. C. H. Firth, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in Oxford. The volume, although published in Cambridge, is got up in a style to match the Oxford edition of Burnet's *History of His Own Time*.

Everybody complains that Burnet is neglected, and everybody neglects him. Is it because he was not good enough to be a hero, or bad enough to be an interesting villain? Assuredly neither hero nor villain is the right word for him. What was he, then? With all their research, and they seem to have searched till nothing is likely to be found after them, it cannot be said that these editors have made it quite clear yet why Gilbert Burnet had so much influence in his day. And until that is made clear, he will never have much influence in a later day. That he had his hand in everything is evident. But why did they let him have his hand in everything? He blundered in diplomacy till we wonder now if his recorded blunders can actually have been made; and everybody knew that he could not keep a secret. But the greatest difficulty which the editors have had before them has been rightly to estimate Burnet's conceit. There are many things that Burnet records which mean something if his account of his own place in them is a correct account; but little or nothing if he is exaggerating his own importance. And so altogether, gladly as the historian will welcome the new facts about Burnet and about his times which the new life contains, it will have little influence in sending men to read Burnet's books.

Nevertheless it is a fascinating biography. The very elusiveness of Burnet's person and personality is fascinating. And if the editors have been enthusiastic in the gathering and sifting of their facts, they have been careful to let no enthusiasm bias them in their judgment of Bishop Burnet.

There are two ways of preparing an anthology of English poetry—one without notes by the

editor, and the other with; and there is no doubt which way the common people prefer. The accomplished student of English poetry will no doubt say, 'Leave me alone with the poet; let him make his own impression upon me; let me think my own thoughts about him.' But the multitude does not understand poetry without an interpreter. Mr. William Stebbing is not ashamed to address himself to the multitude.

He has produced two handsome, delightful volumes under the simple title of *The Poets* (Oxford University Press; 8s. net). The first volume goes from Chaucer to Burns, the second from Wordsworth to Tennyson. His method is to find an edition of his poet—the best edition that he can find—and work slowly through it, quoting here, commenting there, and marking the page of his quotation or his commentary. And when he has finished one poet's works he takes up the works of another.

Now we rejoice in one thing. There is never an attempt at paradox. All is natural, easy, honest. As for 'fine writing,' besides being out of fashion, it never once comes within the reach of Mr. Stebbing's pen, or could come. We do not always agree with his commentary. Why should we? How could we? We do not agree with his commentary on Coleridge; we do not agree with his commentary on Tennyson: the one for the one reason, the other for the other. But we thank him for his book, from the beginning of it to the end of it, because he helps us to understand the poets better than we did.

Mr. George Laurence Gomme (a name much honoured in archæology) has prepared and published an *Index of Archæological Papers, 1665-1890* (Constable; 25s. net). The Index stops with 1890, because annual indexes of archæological papers have been published since 1891, and may be obtained from the same publishers (1s. net each). It is an index of the papers which have appeared in the Journals of the Archæological Societies of Great Britain and Ireland. The index is arranged according to the alphabetical order of the authors' names. Why is there not an index of subjects? That question has already been courteously asked in the 'Publishers' Circular.' Mr. Gomme answers in his Preface. He has not had time or strength to prepare it. He hopes that some younger scholar will set about its preparation

at once. We hope so too. For useful as this index is, an index of topics would be very much more useful. And since Mr. Gomme could not do both, we wish he had done the subjects and left the names alone. An index of places is needed also. But we are glad to see (again from the 'Publishers' Circular') that a competent antiquarian has taken that in hand. We thank Mr. Gomme heartily for adding this to the many services which he has already rendered to the science of archæology.

Mr. Scott Lidgett continues his studies in the evidences of Christianity. His volumes on *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement* and *The Fatherhood of God*, by which he made himself a name as a theologian, are followed by a volume on *The Christian Religion, its Meaning and Proof* (Culley; 6s. net). It covers the whole range of Christian apologetic, and covers it all with capable scholarship and the command of an appropriate vocabulary. Every topic has not the same space allotted to it as we have been familiar with in books of Apologetic. Some topics have passed out of the range of Apologetic; some have not yet entered it. Mr. Scott Lidgett writes for his own time, as every apologist must write. It does not follow that his book will die with the present generation. Even if the next generation neglects it, it may come up again. Does not Dr. Illingworth, in his new book on the Trinity, quote largely from the writings of Paley? But Mr. Scott Lidgett is not concerned with that. He gives his strength to the foundation of the Christian religion; to religion itself—its definition and its factors; to the ethnic religions, and to a sustained comparison between them and Christianity. And then he passes on to claim acceptance for the Christian religion in the face of naturalism. He gives a whole chapter to the argument from design. And only in the last two chapters of the last part of his volume does he expound the Christian doctrine of Man and the Christian doctrine of God.

Some of us are impatient of Apologetics. We move about with our eyes turned in upon ourselves. We do not dispute the superiority of Christianity: why spend time in proving it? But the Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement could not make that mistake. He knows from bitter and prolonged experience that it is useless to speak of the Christ of God to men who have picked up the notion that

the Incarnation and the Resurrection are myths quite indistinguishable from similar myths scattered abroad throughout the religions of the world. No argument that ever was used against Christianity has had more prevailing power than this. And Mr. Scott Lidgett knows that he would simply be beating the air if he were to speak of Christ Jesus as a Redeemer to men whose minds are filled with the idea that comparative religion has brought all redeemers down to one indistinguishable level.

It is only a few months since we noticed Professor Milton Terry's *Biblical Dogmatics*. It was then just issued by an American publisher. Now the book has been undertaken by Mr. Culley of the Methodist Publishing House (10s. 6d. net). We need not repeat our words. Less original than either Adams, Brown, or Clarke, Terry has more consideration for the average plodding student and the ordinary toiling pastor. Every topic that ever was brought within the range of theology is discussed, and discussed separately, so that ten minutes out of a busy day will secure something.

The Rev. Frank Ballard obtained the D.D. degree at London by an essay in Apologetic, which he has now published under the title of *The True God* (Culley; 2s. 6d. net). It is the concentration of that vast literary output which recent years have received from Dr. Ballard and been amazed at. It is addressed to a more cultured, or at least better educated, audience than the larger books. It is the latest, clearest word of Theism to Naturalism, Monism, Pluralism, and Pantheism.

Mr. T. N. Foulis, of Edinburgh, seems to find a market for Nietzsche. The new translation is *Beyond Good and Evil*. The translation is Helen Zimmern's. No price is named.

Carlyle's *John Sterling* and Coleridge's *Poems* are the most recent additions to the 'World's Classics' (Frowde; 1s. net each).

In what year was our Lord born? Sir William Ramsay used to say in the year 6 B.C. But he seems to have changed his mind. A book entitled *The Magi: How they recognized Christ's Star* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) has been written by Colonel Mackinlay, in which it is argued that 8 B.C. is the more likely date, and Sir William

Ramsay, who writes a preface to the book, says that, 'on the whole, though the evidence is still not conclusive, it seems more probable that the date 8 B.C. is right.' How is it more probable? In this way. There was a system of periodic enrolment in the Province of Syria according to a fourteen years' cycle, and the first enrolment was made in the year 8-7 B.C. Ramsay used to think that while this was the rule it was delayed in Syria for about two years, as it sometimes was delayed in other places. But Tertullian distinctly says that the enrolment in Syria at which Jesus was born was made by Saturninus, and Saturninus, we know, governed the province 9-7 B.C.

It was very clever of Colonel Mackinlay to get this preface out of Sir William Ramsay. And his cleverness did not end there. He secured notes from Professor Sanday, Dr. Pinches, and others. These scholars do not stand responsible for Colonel Mackinlay's conclusions. Sir William Ramsay even suggests the existence of a touch of fancy. But their contributions will draw attention to the book, and at least give it a chance.

Let not the memory of John Laidlaw be forgotten. Men like Dr. Robertson Nicoll 'sat under' him at the most impressionable period of their life, and scarcely can express how much they owe him. His memory will not be forgotten. There is no occasion now to fear it. For Professor H. R. Mackintosh has gathered together a volume of his expository sermons, and has written a memoir, marked by sympathy and simplicity, to go with them. The volume is entitled *Studies in the Parables* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

Under the title of *The Lord of Glory*, Professor Warfield, of Princeton Theological Seminary, has published a study of the Designations of our Lord in the New Testament, with especial reference to His Deity (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is not an attractive book for the outsider. But those who have worked at the subject will work at it with renewed zest when they have this book in their hand, fired by the enthusiasm which Professor Warfield throws into all his labours, and glad to be saved the onerous task of gathering the materials together and arranging them in chronological order. What is Professor Warfield's purpose? His purpose is to exalt the Person of our Lord and, by exalting His Person, to com-

mend His salvation. Dr. Warfield's estimate of the Person of Christ is not the popular estimate of our time. He may expect his book to be neglected by the advocates of an extreme kenosis, as well as by the advocates of a mere humanity. But Dr. Warfield was ever a fighter, and their public neglect will not prevent his hearty strokes from taking effect.

Is it better to read an account of Buddhism by a Buddhist or by a Christian? We can ask such a question now. Formerly Buddhism was studied to be refuted. But now it is studied first of all to be known. Buddhism by a Buddhist, therefore, if the Buddhist is a scholar.

What is the difficulty? Scholarship in the East is different from scholarship in the West. The very conception is different. We demand facts; they offer theories. We demand knowledge; they offer edification. Pandit Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki has written *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism* (Luzac; 8s. 6d. net). He is a scholar. He admits that his purpose is to deliver Europe from prevalent misunderstanding of what Buddhism is. And so there is a touch of apologetic throughout. Still he is a scholar. But he is an Eastern scholar. And it is impossible for him to satisfy the demands for fact and verification of fact which a scientifically trained Western reader makes.

With this inevitable reservation we commend the book. It is well written. The author knows his subject. Wisely he confines himself to the Great Vehicle. For it is not possible for one man to be master of the Little Vehicle, or Hināyāna Buddhism, also. Within the vast intricate field of the Great Vehicle he is at home. And if we must verify his facts or inferences for ourselves, by reference to the works of European scholars, that disadvantage is made up to us by the freshness of the point of view and the author's commendable enthusiasm.

The teacher of geology, even in an elementary school, must be up to date. So also must the teacher of the Bible be. Now the teacher of the Bible must not think that up-to-date teaching requires him to reject the resurrection. Professor Swete is a specialist in the study of the Gospels, just as Professor Geikie is a specialist in the study of geology. He has written a manual for the teaching of the resurrection. Its title is *The Appearances*

of our Lord after the Passion (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net). The appearances are described one by one with thorough knowledge of and sensitiveness to the language as well as the thought of the Bible, and of the criticism to which they have been subjected. And there they stand, perfectly credible, and even convincing to one who has already tasted and seen what the Lord is. This is a great service that Dr. Swete has rendered.

Out of the multitude of books for the better teaching of the Bible in schools which the press is now pouring forth, we have no hesitation in selecting 'Bible Lessons for Schools,' by E. M. Knox, Principal of Havergal College, Toronto. The volume before us is *Exodus* (Macmillan; 1s. 6d.). It contains a map and some unusually good illustrations. But the value of the book lies in the author's own writing. The story is retold in excellent English and in thorough loyalty to the truth of revelation, as well as to modern scholarship. It is divided into chapters and sections for its easier teaching in the class.

Messrs. Macmillan have commenced the publication of a new edition of Tennyson. Sooner or later Tennyson *had* to appear in the Eversley Series, where already we have Shakespeare, Milton, and Wordsworth, and where we handle them with so great pleasure. But the Eversley edition is to be distinguished, not only for its outward convenience, but also for the Notes which are to be appended to every volume. These Notes are Tennyson's own—not the guesses of even the most sympathetic editor, but the poet's own explanation of the meaning of his own lines or the occasion upon which he wrote them. The editor of the edition is Hallam, Lord Tennyson. The first volume is ready (4s. net).

Out of the magazines of the last thirty years Mr. Frederic Harrison is gathering his articles and publishing them in volumes, under the title of 'Studies, Religious, Philosophical, Social, and Controversial.' There will be four volumes. The first volume, *The Creed of a Layman* was published in April 1907. The second volume was issued in the end of the year. It is called *The Philosophy of Common Sense* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net).

As the title of the series tells us, the papers are

on all kinds of topics within the range of Mr. Harrison's interest, philosophical ethics and the borderland of religion bulking most largely. Four of the essays were delivered at meetings of the Metaphysical Society, and were published in the very first volume of the *Nineteenth Century* in the year 1877, helping to give that long-lived periodical a good start.

Yet with all their miscellaneousness, one purpose runs through the whole miscellaneous lot. It is a determined purpose, and pathetic in its determination. It is the purpose to prove that Mr. Frederic Harrison is not a man without a religion. That he has no God he does not deny. He does not think a God is necessary to a religion. Are there not scattered over the world tribes that have no gods? But Mr. Harrison feels that if he had no religion, he and those who think with him (and he is not the only Positivist alive even yet) would form, as it were, a tribe of their own, and a tribe so peculiar that anthropologists would be compelled to set them in a category all by themselves.

What, then, is Mr. Frederic Harrison's religion? 'We mean by religion,' he says, 'a scheme which shall explain to us the relations of the faculties to the human soul within, of man to his fellow-men beside him, to the world and its order around him; next, that which brings him face to face with a Power to which he must bow, with a Providence which he must love and serve, with a Being which he must adore—that which, in fine, gives man a doctrine to believe, a discipline to live by, and an object to worship.' Is not this a god? What, otherwise, is the meaning of these capital B's and P's? No, it is only himself and his fellow-men, raised to an ideal dignity so much beyond the real that they deserve to be spoken of in capitals.

Messrs. Macmillan have now republished Professor Moulton's *Modern Reader's Bible* in a single volume (10s. net). When it came out first, in its many dainty purple volumes, we gave it a welcome for the beauty of its outward appearance as well as for the usefulness of its contents. The outward beauty is less now, but the usefulness is more. In this form it will probably become the daily companion of the increasing thousands who must read the Bible intelligently, but have no time to study elaborate commentaries.

Dr. J. R. Illingworth has written another book. Its title is *The Doctrine of the Trinity Apologetically Considered* (Macmillan; 6s.). Is there anything we are more in need of than a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in modern language and with adequate recognition of modern knowledge? Dr. Illingworth is the very man, we said, and here is the book. So we picked it out of the bundle, and sat down.

But it is a deep disappointment. It seems as if Dr. Illingworth had made up his mind, not to describe the doctrine of the Trinity, but to write another book. He begins ever so far away from the doctrine of the Trinity, and writes two chapters of general considerations affecting evolution and the subjectivity of New Testament criticism. And when at last he reaches the doctrine of the Trinity he gets to no grips with it, though he manoeuvres very prettily all round it. And when the end comes we can say we have read another book; but we know very little more of the doctrine of the Trinity than when we began.

The disappointment is the deeper that we are quite sure Dr. Illingworth could have done for the doctrine of the Trinity what he has done for other doctrines, if he had given himself properly to it. Can the explanation be that he now writes too easily?

Messrs. Nisbet have 'beaten the record,' as the phrase goes, in the production of cheap books. When the *Church Directory and Almanack* first appeared at 2s. net, some of us feared that it was too bold an experiment to be successful. Seven hundred and twenty pages of closely packed printing—printing, too, that demanded the most careful proof-reading—seemed to be quite too much for the money. But it has succeeded. And the issue for 1908 is as absolutely accurate as ever.

The Church Pulpit Year Book (2s. net) has also succeeded. This is the fifth yearly issue.

To these Messrs. Nisbet have the last year or two added a *Full Desk Calendar* (1s. net) for the clergyman of the Church of England.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, in Mr. Buckland's Devotional Commentary, has been done by the Bishop of Derry and Raphoe (R.T.S.; 2s.). And as Bishop Chadwick is a born expositor, it is less strictly devotional and more distinctly exegetical

than the other volumes of the series. We make no objection to that. The truth is that true devotional writing is an impossibility to all but a devotional genius; and we had rather receive good, sound, evangelical exposition than the pretence of it.

To Rivington's 'Handbooks' has been added a Commentary on the *Acts of the Apostles*, in two volumes (2s. 6d. net and 2s. net), by the Rev. Bernard Reynolds and Canon Walpole.

In one volume (4s. 6d.) Messrs. Rivington have published *Bible Lessons for the Young*, and *Notes* on the same for teachers, by Dr. M. G. Glazebrook. The 'Lessons' consist of selections from the Old Testament in the words of the Authorized Version. It is a school book without dogma.

For the best and latest books on Psychology (now the most fashionable of all the sciences) consult the catalogue of Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. The very latest is an English translation of Dr. Gustav Störing's *Mental Pathology in its Relation to Normal Psychology* (10s. 6d.). The book is severely scientific, and yet it is expressed in popular language, for it originally formed the subject of a course of lectures delivered in Leipzig. It takes psychology, moreover, on the physical side, which some think the right side to begin the study with. The translation has been done by Thomas Loveday, M.A., lately Professor of Philosophy in the South African College, Cape Town.

Mr. Charles J. Thynne, evangelical publisher, of Great Queen Street, London, has published a second edition of Canon Hobson's Autobiography, *What hath God Wrought?* (2s. net). In spite of the low price, the second edition contains all that the first contained, and typographically it is much more correct.

Messrs. Washburne have published an English translation of *The Degrees of the Spiritual Life* in two volumes, by the Abbé A. Saudreau. It is a wonder that this was not done sooner. The book has had a great circulation in France, and has been translated into several other languages. Now that it has been done, however, it has been done well. The translator is Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B.

So now we have in idiomatic English a com-

petent popular exposition of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the mystic life. The first volume describes the Purgative Way and the Illuminative Life; the second describes the Unitive Life. Doubtless the book will have a considerable sale in English, for our desire to know what mysticism is still far exceeds our knowledge. And whether this may be acceptable mysticism or not, it is thoroughly intelligible. Is the book too large? A little mysticism is not merely a dangerous thing, it is an impossible and self-contradictory thing. Let the book be studied, by all means, from the beginning to the end, with all the heart and also with all the mind.

A volume in memory of Herbert and Alice Rix has been published by Messrs. Williams and Norgate (6s. net). It contains *Sermons, Addresses, and Essays* by Herbert Rix, with an appreciation of him and his wife by Mr. Philip H. Wicksteed. The picture of Alice Rix is winsome, that of Herbert Rix not quite so attractive. And when we enter the book there is the same mixture of good things, and things that are not so good. Why did the editor republish the four lectures on the Persian Bâb? They are written off Professor Browne's book with apparently no further knowledge of the subject; and as an attempt to discredit the Gospels, which is evidently their chief purpose, they are simply ludicrous. Has any one shared with Mr. Rix the hope of recovering 'the Ephesian romance which formed the nucleus of that strange medley now known to us as the Gospel according to St. John'?

But there are infinitely better things in the book than that. There are passages whose beauty will be recognized even when their reasoning will be most surely condemned. When Jesus said to the man sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins are forgiven, the scribes asked, Who can forgive sins but God? Mr. Rix does not often agree with the scribes, and he does not agree with them here. There are three ways, he says, of solving this problem, a theological, an ecclesiastical, and a human way. The theological way is this. It is quite true that God only can forgive sins; but Jesus was God, and therefore Jesus could forgive sins. The ecclesiastical way is that the office of absolver was delegated by God to Jesus just as it is delegated now to the Christian priest. The human way is that Jesus could forgive sins just because He was

a man. 'This,' says Mr. Rix, 'is a profound and far-reaching view, carrying with it an exalted estimate of human nature and a penetrating insight into the nature of sin and the nature of forgiveness. Human nature purified and inspired *can* forgive sin. Human nature transcendent and spiritual touches God. When the soul speaks it is God that speaks; and when the soul forgives it is God that forgives.'

They still teach the Shorter Catechism in the Colonies. Some time ago there came from Sydney (Angus & Robertson) the first part of a Commentary on the Shorter Catechism (*Notes on the Shorter Catechism* was the exact title) by the Rev. John Burgess, M.A., one of the most scholarly Presbyterian ministers of Australia. The second

part (6d.) is now published. It is as simple, practical, good for the teacher's use, as the first part, and of that part we said that we knew nothing for the teacher's use so good.

Has the sale of the Commentary ceased in America? If not, why are the two excellent Commentaries, one on *Leviticus and Numbers*, by Dr. Genung, and one on *Jeremiah*, by Professor Rufus Brown, both published in paper covers? And the paper covers are as ugly as paper covers could be. The volumes belong to the 'American Commentary on the Old Testament,' issued by the Baptist Publication Society (\$2 each). The Commentaries themselves are written for students of the Hebrew text, and they will repay the time spent in studying them.

Contributions and Comments.

Lord of Hosts.

THERE are some questions—perhaps indeed many questions—on which a satisfactory judgment cannot be formed, unless all the relevant facts are placed before those who have to form it. It is remarkable that Mr. Robinson, who specifies so precisely the number of occurrences of 'Lord of Hosts' in many books of the Old Testament, does not specify with equal explicitness the books in which it does not occur. I venture, with your permission, to supply his omission, by setting out the books in a tabular form, similar to the one which he has adopted himself.

'Lord of Hosts,' then, occurs in

Judges	o times.
2 Chronicles	o "
Ezra	o "
Nehemiah	o "
Job	o "
Proverbs	o "
Ecclesiastes	o "
Canticle	o "
Daniel	o "
Joel	o "
Obadiah	o "
Jonah	o "

Two of Mr. Robinson's statments would also be put more exactly thus:

Chronicler	o times.
142 Psalms	o "

For the 3 occurrences in 1 Chronicles (11 17⁷, 24) are simply transcribed from 2 S 5¹⁰ 7⁸, 26: the author of Chronicles, when writing independently, never uses the expression. The psalms in which the title occurs are 24, 46, 48, 59, 69, 80 (4 times), 84 (4 times), 89. Ps 90 will probably be attributed by Mr. Robinson to Moses: excluding this, therefore, as a psalm written *ex hyp.* before the time when the title is known to have come into use, there remain 141 psalms, representing in any case a good many separate writers—we cannot, of course, say how many—who, unless indeed he regards any of them as living before 1 S 1 was written, Mr. Robinson must admit *might* have used it. I naturally do not attach any importance to the fact that the title does not occur in such books as Obadiah and Jonah; but the fact that so many different writers, notwithstanding that the great majority of them, upon any view of their dates, lived in periods when the title was current, and by some writers was being copiously used, nevertheless did not use it, seems to me to neutralise altogether the force of the argument which Mr. Robinson bases upon its non-occurrence in the Hexateuch.

Why the title does not occur in the Hexateuch (upon the critical view of its origin), it does not seem to me that critics are called upon to explain, any more than either they or Mr. Robinson are

called on to explain why the many other writers who, as we have seen, might have used it, do not use it. It may, however, be worth remarking that, whatever may have been Ezekiel's reasons for not using the term, it is pre-eminently a title used by the prophets; and so the four occurrences in Kings are all in the mouths of prophets (Elijah, 1 K 18¹⁶ 19^{10, 14}, and Elisha, 2 K 3¹⁴). This fact, if it is a reason for our not expecting the title in such books as Job and Proverbs, is also a reason why we should not expect to find it in those parts of the Hexateuch which are ascribed by critics to a priestly hand. Prophets, however, are not prominent even in JE; and in Deuteronomy, which, it might be objected, is regarded by the critical school as the work of a prophet, the favourite Divine title, in accordance with the leading parenthetic motive of the book, is 'Jehovah, thy (or your) God.'

X.

Humanism.

I.

WHY does not your 'Humanist' correspondent, Mr. Ferguson, proceed with his equations, and by subtracting 4 from either side of his last equation, reach the legitimate conclusion that

$$0 = 1,$$

so that it may appear that two and two, even in his land of square roots, *do* make four, and nothing more?

G. A. KING.

Croydon.

II.

The statement of the equations under the above title in your last issue is incomplete, and that accounts for the *reductio ad absurdum*.

It ought to be

$$\begin{aligned} (4 - \frac{9}{2})^2 &= (5 - \frac{9}{2})^2, \\ \therefore \pm (4 - \frac{9}{2}) &= \pm (5 - \frac{9}{2}) \\ -(4 - \frac{9}{2}) &= (5 - \frac{9}{2}) \\ \frac{1}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

J. GERLAN WILLIAMS.

Bangor.

III.

The EXPOSITORY TIMES is hardly a mathematical magazine, but perhaps I may be allowed

a word on the interesting pseudo-demonstration that $4 = 5$, given under the above heading by Mr. Ferguson in the January number. The fallacy does not lie, as he suggests, in setting out from the abstract quantity, -20 , but in an important omission in the reckoning itself. In line 4 of the calculation we have arrived at the true statement—

$$(4 - \frac{9}{2})^2 = (5 - \frac{9}{2})^2;$$

but in the next step it has been forgotten that a positive and a negative root give the same square, and that in passing from the square to the root the double sign must be inserted. Thus instead of saying

$$4 - \frac{9}{2} = 5 - \frac{9}{2},$$

we must say

$$\pm (4 - \frac{9}{2}) = \pm (5 - \frac{9}{2}).$$

That is,

$$\pm (-\frac{1}{2}) = \pm \frac{1}{2},$$

or

$$\mp \frac{1}{2} = \pm \frac{1}{2}.$$

On both sides there are two alternative values, and each has a true equivalent opposite. For

$$-\frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } +\frac{1}{2} = +\frac{1}{2}.$$

The abstract reasoning is not misleading. In this case, at least, Intellectualism justifies itself, and Humanism has no problem to solve.

JAMES PATRICK.

Burntisland.

IV.

We are asked what the Humanist would say to the 'pretty figuring' in your last number; perhaps it would be better to ask what Intellectualism would say to it.

We get

$$(4 - \frac{9}{2})^2 = (5 - \frac{9}{2})^2,$$

and then, I suppose, because *humanum est errare*, your Humanist goes on—

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore 4 - \frac{9}{2} &= 5 - \frac{9}{2}, \\ \therefore 4 &= 5. \end{aligned}$$

Your Intellectualist would, I think, have said—

$$\therefore 4 - \frac{9}{2} = -\left(5 - \frac{9}{2}\right),$$

$$\therefore -\frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2},$$

$$\therefore 4 = 4.$$

‘The reckoning sets out from -20 , which is only an abstract value; yet here, as always and everywhere, two and two make four.’

W. E. SHERWOOD.

Oxford.

‘The Fulness of the Time’ (Gal. iv. 4).

APOLOGETICS is indebted to history for a valuable contribution. But as commonly presented the argument drawn from the preparation in history for Christianity runs two dangers. It may be so drawn as to be double-edged, thus giving seeming cause for the objection that the Christian beginnings are no more than points in an historical nexus. While on the other hand it may spread itself too widely and show lines of preparation which have no contact with the setting of Christianity. History yields historical facts only; and the beginnings of Christianity must have an historical setting, and so from the purely historical point of view are bound to appear as parts of greater causal sequences. The real apologetic contribution comes from a philosophy of history which, below the data and facts of history, detects purposes, intentions, fulfilments, failures. The spread of Christianity speeding along the Roman roads in the vehicle of the Greek tongue simply shows its place in the greater nexus of world-wide history. But a philosophy of history may have something to add about the moving impulse, or the concomitance of vehicle and impulse.

Again, the Græco-Roman culture produced types of mind, or at least some instances of them, that were akin to the Christian spirit, and revealed some spiritual aspirations and some wide humanitarian movements. But in reality so far from those being preparations for Christianity, they showed themselves in circles hostile to Christianity or oblivious of it. And thus such lines coalesce nowhere with Christianity, and had no points of historical connexion with it. The actual beginnings of Christianity are in other planes of society

and thought. And here again the apologetic value lies rather in a philosophy of history, which, moving over wider periods, sees these thought phenomena running on lines parallel to Christianity, and breaking out into actual contact only after centuries of separate existence. The scattered threads reunite in the later growth of Christianity, and in the maturer victories of Christian thought.

A. W. MITCHELL.

Ardentinny.

Matt. ii. 2.

I HAVE received an unexpected corroboration of my reading in Mt 2², ‘We in the East have seen His star.’ I sent the December number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to our learned friend Dr. Porphyrios Logothetes, the present Archbishop of Mount Sinai, and he writes from Raitho (Tôr):

Περὶ τοῦ ‘ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ,’ ἡμεῖς πάντοτε εἶχομεν τὴν ἰδέαν Σας ὅτι σημαίνει, ‘ὄντες (εὐρισκόμενοι) ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ εἶδομεν τὸν Ἀστέρα.’

I hope that those of your readers who do not understand modern Greek will be able to follow this, and to see that my reading corresponds with that of the Orthodox Greek Church.

A similar instance occurred to me with the reading of the Sinai Palimpsest in Jn 14¹. When I first told the monks about it, in 1895, I being delighted at a fresh testimony to our Lord’s divinity, they replied, ‘But that is the way *we* have always read it.’ ‘And then Jesus said: Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, and in Me ye are believing.’ I then saw that you can read it either way, taking the first *πιστεύετε* as an imperative, and the second as a present indicative, with the Sinai Palimpsest; or, *vice versa*, as in both our English versions. The Greek is here ambiguous, but the Old Syriac is not at all so. The Peshitta makes both verbs imperatives, which can hardly be right.

AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

Cambridge.

Matt. vii. 25, 27.

THE A.V. put twice, ‘and beat upon the house’; the R.V. left the first ‘beat’ and replaced the second by ‘smote.’ That the latter is the translation of *προσέκοψαν* is clear; but what about the first

'beat' for προσέπεισαν in v.²⁵? Did the men of the A.V. anticipate, and the Revisers approve, the reading προσέπαισαν, which, to my knowledge, was first put into the text by Lachmann, approved by the Dutch scholar Naber (*Mnemosyne*, 1881, 276), and again received into the text by Blass, 1901? Then we must put προσπαίω as a new verb into the dictionaries and concordances of the Greek Testament. In the Old Testament it seems to be found with Symmachus, Ps 90 (91)¹², where the LXX has προσκόπτειν. But I suppose the A.V. chose 'beat' in v.²⁵, despite προσπίπτειν, in accord-

ance with v.²⁷, just as the Vulgate put *irruere* in v.²⁷ in agreement with v.²⁵. The Syriac Version has also the same verb in both places. Weymouth (*The N.T. in Modern Speech*) seems to have missed the sense, when he put first 'beat against' and then 'burst upon'; for προσκόπτειν is certainly weaker. In that case it needs but a good 'stroke' and the house falls. German commentators scarcely notice this question; whether it is otherwise in English commentaries, I do not know.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

In the Study.

Congress of Religion at Oxford.

THE International Congress for the History of Religion will be held this year in Oxford. The first Congress was held in Paris in 1900, under the Presidency of the late Professor Albert Réville; the second in Basel in 1904, under the Presidency of Professor Conrad von Orelli. For the third meeting the Council of the University of Oxford have reserved rooms in the Examination Schools, and there the Congress will be held on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, September 15 to 18, 1908.

There will be eight sections—(1) Religion of the Lower Culture, including Mexico and Peru; (2) Religion of the Chinese and of the Japanese; (3) Religion of the Egyptians; (4) Religion of the Semites; (5) Religion of India and of Iran; (6) Religion of the Greeks and of the Romans; (7) Religion of the Teutons, of the Celts, and of the Slavs; (8) the Christian Religion. Papers will be read in each of these sections, and they will be followed by a discussion. And, besides these, there will be general meetings for lectures or papers of wider import.

A strong local committee has been formed, including Rev. C. J. Ball, Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet, Dr. Edward Caird, Professor S. R. Driver, Principal A. M. Fairbairn, Mr. Warde Fowler, Professor Percy Gardner, Dr. Buchanan Gray, Mr. F. Ll. Griffith, Dr. R. Hoernle, Professor A. A. Macdonell, Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Dr. Gilbert Murray, Sir John Rhys, Professor W. Sanday, Professor A. H. Sayce. The Secretaries are Dr. Estlin Carpenter and Dr. L. R. Farnell, from either of whom members' tickets may be had (£1 each; ladies, 10s. each).

The International Congress of Religion will be the great event this year in Oxford. It may be an event of far-reaching significance for the whole world.

Cherubim and the Flame of a Sword.

In his notes on Gn 3²⁴ Professor A. R. Gordon suggests that to the Hebrews the Cherubim personified the thundercloud, and the flame of a sword the lightning. If this is so, where would these ideas find a place in an exposition or a sermon?

Grapes, Pomegranates, Figs.

We know that there are certain subjects which a preacher is bound to treat symbolically. With the trees in the garden of Eden, with the Cherubim and flame of a sword, he has no choice. But what is his duty with topics which are clearly intended to be taken literally? When the spies returned from searching out the land, they brought back with them grapes, pomegranates, and figs. In a sermon on Nu 13^{21, 23, 27} in the volume referred to in the Notes of Recent Exposition, Canon Winterbotham symbolizes these fruits. Is he at liberty?

Perhaps it does not answer the question to say that the symbolism works easily and effectively. But, first, there should be an introduction on the situation. The land is the land of promise. Abraham had left his home in Ur of the Chaldees to inherit it. The Israelites had left Egypt for it. They had wandered forty years in the wilderness, upheld by this one faith, that the land was there and was theirs. And now they stood at the entrance.

Twelve spies were sent to search out the land. Canon Winterbotham warns us against misunderstanding the word spies. But was this act worldly prudence or the will of God? At any rate, when the spies returned they brought a good report of the land.

That was the great thing. They did not deny that there would be difficulties to overcome in taking possession of the land. Ten of the spies exaggerated the difficulties. They reckoned them insurmountable, indeed; and that, not because they were pessimists by nature, but because they did not hold the promise before their eyes, 'To thee and to thy seed will I give it.' But even Caleb and Joshua did not deny that there would be trouble before they could sit down each under his own vine and his own fig tree. And we also, as we go forward to take possession of that inheritance which He has purchased with His precious blood, are assured that we must go through much tribulation. But is the land worth it? That is the point. And the spies were unanimous on that point. They showed the grapes, the pomegranates, and the figs, and they said, in conclusive evidence, 'This is the fruit of it.'

Let us go forward, then. What did you say was the fruit of it?—grapes, pomegranates, figs. Was it mere accident that they brought these three? Or is it that the obvious fruits of the land are the obvious riches of the kingdom? Canon Winterbotham begins with the grapes.

For the first and the best of all the fruits of the kingdom are the grapes, the grapes which grow on the Vine. 'I am the Vine.' 'First and foremost,' says Canon Winterbotham, 'the Lord Jesus, and that which He is to the faithful soul, in His Word, by His Spirit, through His Sacraments. Brethren, there are people who want to have religion, Christianity, the Church, and to leave out the Lord Jesus. They have no eyes for the beauty of this cluster, no taste for the refreshing sweetness of these grapes. There is nothing to be said of them but this, If any man love not the Lord, let him be anathema.'

Next the pomegranates. 'Now the pomegranate had a very marked character, as the fruit of the sanctuary, among the children of Israel. If you look in Exodus, chs. 27 and 29, you will see that the pomegranate was to be embroidered on the robe of the ephod. If you look again in the second book of Chronicles, chs. 3 and 4, you will see that Solomon, following the accepted

symbolism of his religion, made hundreds of pomegranates for the decoration of his Temple. It was the sacred fruit of ecclesiastical symbolism. Many a time have I looked at the pomegranates which grew so freely in my garden in Australia, and noted how exactly they lent themselves to this ecclesiastical use. Their brilliant colouring; their fine, well-marked, but stiff and artificial-looking shape; the graceful hang of the fruit upon its stalk, which yet suggested somehow that it was done for effect: all this marked it out as exactly suited among the fruits of the earth for artistic and for ecclesiastical use.'

Thus the pomegranates are made symbols of the public worship of God—the joyful sound of the churchgoing bell, the fellowship of the saints, the grace of Sacraments, the office of the ministry. And let us not, in going up to possess this land, dream that we can safely forsake the assembling of ourselves together. As the Westminster divines have it, 'The Spirit of God maketh the reading, but especially the preaching of the word, an effectual means.'

And last the figs. The figs are the common fruit, the daily bread of the common people in the East. They symbolize the daily task of life, the mother in the home, the father in the field or counting-house. Why did they bring figs? Grapes and pomegranates—these are the luxuries of life, and they do make manifest the abundant fertility of the land. But the fig is so ordinary, a mere necessity of living. To which the spies replied, that nevertheless these were not ordinary figs, and they pointed to their size and fragrance. And the daily duty of life is no ordinary duty when it is done in the name of Christ.

A servant with this clause

Makes drudgery divine;

Who sweeps a room as for Thy laws,

Makes that and th' action fine.

Judith.

The editor of the *International Journal of Apocrypha* is apparently an enthusiast in his subject. He is getting men to study the Apocrypha, and to study it scientifically. But he is not content with his Journal. Messrs. Bagster announce a series of volumes, of which he is to be the editor, under the title of 'The Apocrypha in English Literature.' The Book of Judith will be issued first.

The Daring of the Post-Exilic Prophets.

How does it happen that the Post-Exilic Prophets (we say the Post-Exilic Prophets because

we have been reading Dr. Bennett's book) dared so much more than we do in the things they say about God? Perhaps we are too systematic. Perhaps we look not only at God and ourselves, but at the consistency of our theological systems.

For example. Which of us would dare to say that God may forgive a man before he shows either faith or repentance? The Post-Exilic Prophets say that. They say it again and again. They dare to offer the forgiveness of God as a reason why men should return to Him. Professor Bennett refers to the Second Isaiah (44²²), who urges men 'to return unto God' because He has blotted out their sins and redeemed them. It is after God has intervened to deliver Jerusalem that, according to Zec 12, there is poured out upon the people the spirit of grace and of supplication, and they are moved to mourn for their sins. Ezekiel is even so bold as to declare that we amend our lives because God gives us a new heart and a new spirit (11¹⁹).

The fiercest of all the theological controversies that the Church has ever had was over the question who moves first, God or man? Our fathers said God; we say man. Are we right? Dr. Bennett's whole section on atonement and forgiveness is particularly suggestive.

James Hope Moulton.

In the *Expositor* for January, Professor Deissmann refers to Dr. J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. He quotes the saying of Blass that 'the isolation of the New Testament is a bad thing for the interpretation of it, and must be broken down as much as possible.' And he says, 'James Hope Moulton has broken down the isolation of the New Testament. He introduces himself modestly as inheritor of the work of his late father, W. F. Moulton, whose English edition of Winer's *Grammar* had for almost forty years favourably influenced exegetical studies in England and America. His aged mother, who compiled the copious index of texts for him, as she had done forty years before for her husband, may symbolize to us the personal continuity between the elder and the younger generation of grammarians. The son has inherited, firstly, the scholar's instinct for research, united with fervent love of the New Testament. He has further inherited the solid foundation of the book itself, Winer and Moulton's *Grammar*. But he was also equipped with a modern training in Greek, and by his own industry he has created on that foundation an entirely new book.'

Milligan and Moulton.

On another page, but in the same number of the *Expositor*, Dr. Moulton writes of the association with him in the study of New Testament Greek of Dr. George Milligan. And he recalls with pride the association of their fathers in the work of the Revision of the New Testament, and also in the editing of the Fourth Gospel for Schaff's *Popular Commentary*. They are both pleased, he says, to take up the entail of that partnership.

Virgin Birth.

In his book on the Virgin Birth, Professor Orr does refer to the birth of Amen-hotep III. And he points out (it is in a separate note) that the god is represented as incarnating himself in the husband, so that it is no proper case of virgin birth.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been contributed by F. W. Atkin, Esq., 15 Bondicar Terrace, Blyth, Northumberland, to whom a copy of Purves' *The Life Everlasting* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for March must be received by the 1st of February. The text is Lk 19^{41, 42}.

The Great Text for April is Lk 21¹⁹—'In your patience ye shall win your souls.' A copy of Deissmann's *New Light on the New Testament* and of Fleming's *Israel's Golden Age* or of Davidson's *The Stoic Creed*, will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of March.

The Great Text for May is Lk 22¹⁹—'And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.' A copy of Bennett's *The Post-Exilic Prophets* or of Scott's *The Fourth Gospel* will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of April.

The Great Text for June is Lk 23³⁴—'Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.' A copy of Bennett's *The Post-Exilic Prophets* or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of May.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.